

Legislative Council

Wednesday, 28 September 1983

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Clive Griffiths) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

FUEL AND ENERGY

Demand: Ministerial Statement

HON. PETER DOWDING (North—Minister for Fuel and Energy) [2.17 p.m.]: Mr President, I seek leave of the House to make a short ministerial statement in respect of a document concerning the Western Australian fuel demand.

Leave granted.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: The "Western Australian Fuel Demand Report 1983-2003" prepared by the State Energy Commission of Western Australia is hereby tabled for the information of the Parliament and the people of Western Australia.

The report forecasts transport and non-transport fuel demand in Western Australia year by year to 1993, with a spot forecast for the year 2003. Its purpose is to provide a general overview of the State's energy requirements and an up-to-date perspective of the State's long-term energy future.

The report is not intended to be an expression of State Energy Commission planning policy. It is emphasised in the report that energy planning in the commission is an integrated process using several scenarios drawn from various sources, including the 20-year fuel demand report. The report plays an important part in the commission's role as an adviser to the Government on energy matters in the State.

The report has been collated from a large number of individual submissions and various authoritative publications and, as far as possible, the most up-to-date information has been used in it.

The last fuel demand report was issued to the public three years ago in March 1980. Preparation of the present report began early in 1983 and has since undergone extensive review within the commission. The Energy Advisory Council has contributed to the preparation of the report and has endorsed it in its final form.

The report indicates the Western Australia's total primary fuel demand is expected to increase between 3.8 and 5.7 per cent annually over the next 10 years. However, the growth rate will depend heavily on two proposed major development

projects: The aluminium smelter in the south-west and the liquefied natural gas plant to export North-West Shelf natural gas.

Under low growth conditions the State's primary fuel demand is expected to increase from 303 petajoules in 1981-82 to 450 petajoules in 1992-93. Under high growth conditions demand could be as high as 550 petajoules in 1992-93. The availability of natural gas from the North-West Shelf next year will have a marked effect on energy usage and supply patterns in Western Australia, particularly in the non-transport sector. Currently oil based fuels dominate the State's primary fuel demand with 64 per cent of the market. The report indicates that by 1986-87 the market share of oil based fuels will be reduced to about 45 per cent.

The report estimates that by 1986-87, natural gas will constitute approximately 50 per cent of non-transport fuel supplies, which is three times the 1981-82 levels. Coal consumption is expected to remain around current levels until 1989-90, when production levels are expected to increase to satisfy new demands.

In the transport area, motor spirit currently represents approximately 50 per cent of all energy used for transport in Western Australia. This situation is expected to change only marginally within the forecast period, with motor spirit representing around 48 per cent in 1992-93. However, it is recognised that alternative fuels such as LPG and alcohols could be developed to play a larger role in the transport sector than envisaged under the conservative assumptions used in the report.

The introduction of natural gas from the North-West Shelf will significantly change the State's dependence on imported oil. The report indicates that imported oil and oil products will account for only 15 per cent of Western Australia's total energy demand in 1991-92 compared with the 1981-82 level of 46 per cent.

The Energy Commission would welcome any comments on the contents and format of the report.

Mr President, I commend this report to the attention of the House.

The report was tabled (see paper No. 289).

ELECTORAL

Referendum: Petition

On motions by the Hon. Kay Hallahan the following petition bearing the signatures of 14 persons was received, read, and ordered to lie upon the Table of the House—

TO:

The Honourable the President and Members of the Legislative Council of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

WE, the undersigned citizens of Western Australia:

1. Wish to elect half of the Members of the Legislative Council at each general election using a method similar to that used for Western Australian Senate elections.
2. We also wish to reduce the number of Legislative Councillors from 34 to 22 and to establish the right of each elector to cast a vote equal in value to each other vote cast in the election of Members to the Legislative Council.
3. Request the above reforms be decided by the people at a referendum.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that you will give this matter earnest consideration and your Petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(See paper No. 291.)

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS: DISPUTE

Pilbara: Urgency Motion

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Clive Griffiths): I have received the following letter addressed to me—

Dear Mr President,

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 63, I wish to advise of my desire to move for the adjournment of the House until Monday, 10 October at 4.30 p.m.

Because the Western Australian State Government—

1. Has adopted a policy of buying industrial peace at any price in dealing with its own employees which policy has by example had an effect on the non-government sector;
2. has failed to take any positive stand in support of the Industrial Commissions, seriously weakening the effectiveness of those Commissions in the resolution of industrial disputes; and
3. has refused to make any positive statement condemning those responsible for the very serious disputes thus giving encouragement to the more militant union leaders to continue their activities; and
4. has submitted to the unhealthy influences of highly paid and biased Minis-

terial Advisers leading to a very serious lack of Government credibility in Industrial Relations;

the Government must accept a heavy responsibility for the continuance of the current series of industrial stoppages.

For the above reasons this House condemns the Government's industrial policies and performance which have resulted in the most serious threat to employment and industry in this State in recent years.

Your sincerely,

G. E. MASTERS

MEMBER FOR WEST PROVINCE

It will be necessary for four members to rise in their places to indicate their support for this motion.

Four members having risen in their places,

HON. G. E. MASTERS (West) [2.32 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Monday, 10 October at 4.30 p.m.

I draw the attention of the House to the letter quoted by the President and, in particular, to the last paragraph, which reads as follows—

... this House condemns the Government's industrial policies and performance which have resulted in the most serious threat to employment and industry in this State in recent years.

The letter is intended to condemn the Labor Government of this State for its industrial relations policies. In doing so, we censure and condemn the Minister who is charged with the responsibility to carry out those policies and who is, of course, in part, responsible for much of the industrial activity which has taken place recently.

The reasons for the disputes are many, but obviously the disputes are tearing Western Australia apart; they are threatening industry and employment and the blame must rest fairly and squarely on the present Labor Government of Western Australia.

The public are appalled at the record of this Government since it came to office in March 1983. Prior to winning the last State election, the Labor Party promised peace, harmony, goodwill, consensus, and understanding. It said the wicked Government of which I was part was responsible for much of the industrial unrest and caused many of the problems. However, now we see manifested, the performance of the Labor Government since March of this year.

I heard that the Premier of Western Australia (the Hon. Brian Burke) had the audacity to say that much of the cause for the industrial disputation in the Pilbara was the legislation I brought forward on behalf of the Government late last year. Of course, such a comment is absolutely ridiculous and stupid and I would very much like someone in this House to try to justify it.

Since March this year the Government has staggered from one industrial crisis to another and the position is getting worse, not better. It appears the Government and, in particular, the Minister, has been spending all his time keeping his head down and, like Nelson who put his spyglass to his blind eye, he is saying, "I cannot see a thing. What dispute?"

Hon. P. H. Lockyer: You can see their attitude to it by looking at the members on the front bench opposite.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The Ministers may laugh, however, if the Minister for Industrial Relations is not prepared to listen to questions and comments in this House or to act in the interests of the public of Western Australia, I am very sorry for him.

We should look at the performance of the Minister and the Government since March of this year. The Hon. Peter Dowding should pay great attention to what I am saying, because some of the responsibility for the present industrial situation rests on his shoulders. It is of no use to smile at the misfortunes of the people who are on strike, who are losing pay, and who have lost their jobs.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Working under an axe which you created and which is unworkable.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: It is typical of the Minister for Mines, who supposedly represents the Pilbara and the people in the north who are suffering drastically because of the present situation, that he should smile in this debate.

Hon. P. H. Lockyer: It is absolutely disgraceful.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: During the time this dispute has continued we have not heard one word from the Minister for Mines in support of the people he represents. All we see is a smile in this House.

In March of this year the Government adopted a dangerous policy. For services rendered, if one likes, prior to the election by some of the union leaders and groups now taking industrial action, many highly paid union advisers were appointed on the pretext that they would advise the Government on its industrial policy.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: They have settled a lot of disputes and you can't deny that. They are not using your stormtroopers either.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Those highly paid advisers have done nothing apart from giving biased advice to the Government, to its peril. The advisers' policy has been simply this: Buy industrial peace at any cost. No matter what happens, we see this has been taking place. From the very first day the Government obtained power the policy has been simply to buy industrial peace. In the very first week the Labor Government was in office the MTT workers threatened to strike. What did the Government do? It paid up straightaway. In the first week it was in office, under the threat of a strike, the Government said, "We will pay you \$14.30 each per week". That was an indication of what was to come.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: They had a very good advocate.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The settlement of the MTT dispute was a disgrace and an embarrassment to the Government of this State. It set a pattern for what was to happen in this State from that time on. The Industrial Commission refused that application for an increase.

Several members interjected.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The Industrial Commission refused that application and while an appeal was coming forward, the Government moved in and overrode the Industrial Commission.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Obviously members opposite are upset.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I am not upset. You continue.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Despite an appeal which was before the Industrial Commission, the MTT dispute was settled. The Government completely ignored the commission, overrode it, and went about its business. The Government has made an ass of the Industrial Commission in this State from its first week in office.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Could you repeat that? You said that it made an ass of the Industrial Commission in this State.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I said that the Government made an ass of the Industrial Commission in this State and in another State. I am referring to the Federal commission. I know what the Minister is getting at. Sir John Moore pulled up an advocate of the Government in court and asked, "Will you be dealing with the situation in which the MTT workers were refused an increase by this

commission and an appeal had been lodged by the union against that decision and while the appeal was pending, the State Government, as I understand it, awarded an agreement that amounts that had been refused to the drivers and the conductors should be paid to them?"

The State Government ignored and made a fool of the industrial commissions in the Federal and State scenes. That action set the pattern for this Government. In a year that decision will cost \$1.46 million.

The saga continues. Mr Dans made a Press statement in the early stages, and it was reported in the *Western Mail*. In fact, there was a rotten photograph of him as well.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I agree with you. It was probably taken by one of your mates.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The article reads—

His job is to walk a tightrope between trade unions, industry and Labor policy, with the stated aim of removing politics from industrial relations.

From that day on he has done nothing but bring politics into industrial relations. We have had the MTT strike, and the hospital workers' strike. There was a statement in the Press of 6 May this year about the hospital workers. It was headed, "Hospital workers jump Pay Freeze". That decision by this Minister will cost \$3.72 million. The Government said it would observe the pay freeze.

I refer further to the Press of 10 May this year. A statement was made under the heading "Energy Workers Get Pay Increase". The Minister said the advisers had done a wonderful job, but all they did was hand out money. Anyone could do that. All this Government does is say to employers, "Pay up or else".

If ever there was a serious condemnation of the Government, it had to be the offer it made to the Perth City Council workers. The Government merely said, "What can we pay you to get you back to work?" This was to be at the expense of the public, and that offer set the pattern of this Government's interference in the industrial scene. It talked about non-interference in that scene, but we have had these sorts of activities to which I have referred, which give us a firm understanding of what this Government is all about.

Hon. Mark Nevill: This is the same speech you made three months ago.

Hon. Tom Stephens: An election is in the air.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I have said these things before—they are important. I will keep on saying them, because I must bring to the notice of the House all such matters, as well as the Govern-

ment's broken promises. We must understand that this Government has brought on the problems we have today. Of course, we will keep reminding the Government of what it has done. We will shove these things down its throat. The Government has tried to control the Industrial Commission, and the end result has been the Government's responsibility.

It fails to understand it is the major employer in this State. If it did understand, the Government would try to set an example, to set a standard for employers in private industry. It does not understand that industry cannot match these payouts at any price.

Several members interjected.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: These events are the direct responsibility of the Government as a major employer. Of course, the Government has an expectation that private industry will follow its lead, but private industry cannot. The Government is obsessed with gaining control of the Legislative Council so that it can get rid of our House of Review. It seems to be obsessed with appointing advisers to repay those people for good service, or help in the past. It is almost a bribe. It is obsessed with appointing committees of inquiries—hundreds of them. Every time it gets into a fix it appoints a committee.

Government members interjected.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I will not refer to the many broken promises, because the list just goes on and on. In these recent industrial disputes, the Government has lacked the guts to stand up and be counted. It has been challenged on many occasions in this House to make a statement on these disputes, in the hope that it would say to the workers, "Go back to work". Not once has that been said in this Parliament.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Is that what you said when you were in Government? Hamersley was out for 11 weeks in your time.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I understand that this Minister, who represents the Pilbara, is embarrassed, and in a difficult situation. He has done less than anyone about the dispute in the Pilbara. He has made no remark or comment either publicly or in this House about that dispute.

Government members interjected.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I invite him to make a statement condemning the action of these workers.

Hon. Peter Dowding: With a view to what?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: He should make a statement with a view to making his position

clear. Where does he stand on this issue? Which side is he on?

Hon. Peter Dowding: Did you take sides?

Hon. D. K. Dans: Whose side are you on?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I and the other members of my party are on the side of those suffering greatly, and on the side of those who will suffer in the future. While thousands of people are bleeding, thousands of people are losing their incomes, jobs and industries are being threatened and, in some cases, overseas markets are being lost, the Government asks us, "Which side are you on?" We are on the side of the public.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Which markets have been lost?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: We are not dictated to by that little group up at Trades Hall.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Answer it! Which markets have been lost?

Hon. D. K. Dans: You are misleading the House.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Yesterday I obtained answers to questions on notice, and I will quote some of those questions and answers because they give an indication of the lack of concern of this Minister and the Government as a whole. The first part of the question was—

Has the Minister read a report in *The Australian Financial Review* page 9 of 21 September 1983 which states that "India is reaping big benefits from the Pilbara strikes", and where it was also stated "one third of the Japanese shipping was being directed to Robe River and two thirds to India"?

The answer was—

No.

The second part of the question was—

Is the Government concerned that the strike has now become the most damaging one in the iron ore industry, and will result in permanent loss of overseas markets?

The reply was—

The Government is extremely concerned at the possible implications of the strike.

No comment was made about overseas markets, just a bland statement which meant nothing at all. I ask the Minister to seriously consider this question, because it is a genuine inquiry. This House should not be insulted by those sorts of answers. We want to know whether the Minister has the facts or understands the problems we face.

The fourth part of the question was—

What employment prospects does the State Government see for those workers in other parts of the State or the metropolitan area who have left the strike torn towns or are about to leave?

The answer was—

That is a question which is purely speculative.

What sort of answer is that for a House of Parliament? What sort of answer is that to an Opposition which seeks information? People have left that area and others are about to leave it, and they do not know what to do. They want some assistance from the Government or the Minister.

Hon. Peter Dowding: What about your performance?

Several members interjected.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Mr President, the answer was that the question was purely speculative. The Minister has no interest and no care for the public. Certainly the people affected should understand the lack of care that the Government and, particularly, this Minister have for them.

I refer to a question which was asked last week and answered yesterday. I asked—

Has the Minister investigated my comments in the House regarding a reported request by the AWU to hold a combined union meeting to vote on a return to work?

The Minister replied as follows—

I have no evidence to support the member's proposition.

Does that indicate the Minister has inquired into the matter and it is not true, or that he has not bothered about it, or that he has heard nothing through the grapevine and has not followed it up? It was a genuine question and that group of people wanted to go back to work and have a meeting. The least the Minister could have done was to make inquiries and follow it through and give a proper answer to the House.

Part (3) of the question asked—

If "No" to (1), will the Minister make urgent representations to the unions involved supporting a combined meeting and report back to Parliament at the next sitting of the House?

The Minister replied—

Ongoing discussions have been taking place and are continuing.

That means nothing; it was a genuine question, and that is no answer at all. Today the Minister was on the radio on a talkback programme and he made the sort of comment we have heard before.

He said "I can see light at the end of the tunnel". I understand Mt. Newman may be going back tomorrow. I heard there was a possibility—

Hon. D. K. Dans: We have been working towards that all the time.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: There was light at the end of the tunnel six weeks ago when I asked the Minister the questions to which I have referred. He has tunnel vision. Good Lord! How long is the tunnel, and what sort of tunnel is it? Is it the same light and the same tunnel?

We have become used to that sort of answer from the Minister. It is his traditional response. He usually says "No" or "I don't know", or "Couldn't care less", or "There is light at the end of the tunnel" and thinks if he can keep his head down the problem will go away.

I want to raise another matter of great importance, and I put it to the Minister. This State has had a terrible record in recent months—as bad as any in recent years. The effect on this State is very serious.

Hon. Graham Edwards interjected.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: It is as bad or worse than it has been for many years. It is a very serious situation and it comes at a time when we have a Government which said before coming to office "All will be peace and harmony, goodwill and consensus".

Hon. D. K. Dans: I do not recollect saying that.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The Government was saying "Follow us, and we will solve all the problems". The problems have only just begun and the Government has been in office only six months. I will give some figures to support my argument. However, I think that the Minister, having failed so miserably, should seriously consider resigning. He has been a total failure in his six months in office. People in Western Australia are getting into a terrible state. We are losing overseas markets and the Minister laughs. He does not take it seriously at all; he has failed miserably to achieve peace and goodwill—his Government's promise.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Who do you think I am, the Angel Gabriel?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I guess the Minister thinks it is funny to ask that question.

Hon. D. K. Dans: We know who you are; the representative of the John Birch Society in Australia.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I said in the early stage of the debate the Government carried out certain actions which resulted in the industrial troubles we have today. The Government shelled out and said it would buy industrial peace, and now it is lumbered with the result of that policy.

We are concerned at the Minister's performance, and I think the Government should consider changing his portfolio. This Minister supposedly understands the industrial relations scene.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: There is no chance of his portfolio being changed.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The Minister has deliberately misled this House on at least two occasions.

Withdrawal of Remark

The PRESIDENT: Order! That remark is out of order and I ask the member to withdraw it.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I withdraw.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The Minister has given answers to questions which the Opposition has found difficult to understand and accept. He has given answers to questions on pay rises and increases that were awarded to Government employees. We asked for details and were told the information was not readily available. We believe that is not correct; we believe the Minister certainly has not given us the answer that should be forthcoming. It is ridiculous to expect Opposition members to accept that sort of answer, knowing as we do that the Minister must most assuredly have had the information available to make any decision.

The other matter we find difficult to understand relates to a comment made previously by the Minister in answer to a question I asked on Wednesday, 17 August. I point out the conflict between his reply then and a subsequent statement he made. I asked—

Does Mr McGinty's contract require him to work only eight hours per day five days per week; and are those hours worked on a flexi-time arrangement?

The Minister replied "No".

In a talkback radio programme a day or so ago he said—

You must remember Mr McGinty only works for me eight hours a day five days a week and that is the area I am looking at.

If a Minister can come to this place and give information which conflicts, obviously there must be reservations among the public and the Opposition. In normal circumstances when a Minister makes that sort of mistake or statement, the practice in our system is that he is expected to resign. In a way Parliament has been misled. The Opposition has difficulty in understanding how that sort of comment can be made and accepted.

Having made that statement and given two conflicting views on separate days surely the Minister should consider handing in his resignation.

Hon. D. K. Dans: No chance.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: There we are! How often must we ask questions and be told to mind our business, or that it does not matter, or that the Minister could not care less, or we get two different answers on two days? What sort of Minister is he?

Hon. Fred McKenzie: That has never been said; you have misread the answers.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I have not.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: If Mr McGinty upsets you so much perhaps you should take the matter up with him.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The Hon. Fred McKenzie asked me to produce the facts.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: You used the words "could not care less".

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I am happy to give the honourable member that evidence immediately I sit down. One part of it is a question to the House and the other is a statement on a radio talkback programme. I read that statement word for word.

One can only expect difficulties in industrial relations when a Minister acts in that way and makes those sort of comments. I draw the House's attention to the normal practice in that sort of situation when a Minister is found out; he has to resign because it is totally wrong. The Minister's action in buying industrial peace has flowed to the private sector and caused a great deal of trouble.

Hon. D. K. Dans: What evidence do you have of that?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I draw the Minister's attention to the embarrassment he and his party have caused to the industrial commissions, Federal and State. It is no good Mr Dans' tut-tutting and saying it has not happened, because it did. In the Perth City Council dispute he was rapped over the knuckles by Mr Coleman who said the Minister was supposedly an expert in industrial relations. His party claims he knows all the answers; he knows only one answer, and that is the trade union answer. Mr Coleman said the Minister obviously did not understand the industrial arbitration system. Those are his words, not mine.

I have mentioned the MTT dispute and quoted the comments of Sir John Moore when he stated his opinion that that sort of decision was making a fool of the Industrial Commission, or words to that effect.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Would you repeat that?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I read Sir John Moore's statement.

Hon. Jim Brown: They had a very good advocate.

Hon. N. F. Moore: Read Sir John's statement again.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Sir John Moore made the comment in a case before the Federal court in speaking to the advocate, Mr Gerard Overman—a first-class advocate. Sir John said—

Will you be dealing with the situation in which the MTT workers were refused an increase by a member of this commission and an appeal had been lodged by the union against that decision, and while the appeal was pending the State Government, as I understand it, awarded or agreed that amounts that had been refused to the drivers and conductors should be paid to them?

I point out that there can be no better example of the embarrassment that the industrial commissions must feel, and the difficulties they face, than that. When the Minister was on this side of the House, he spent much of the time saying that the umpire's decision was important and that the industrial arbitration system was sacrosanct.

Hon. P. G. Pental: And that the Government should not interfere.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: In his first week, the Minister reversed every statement he had made. In the Pilbara dispute he did not agree with the deregistration proceedings when the Industrial Commission said that it would have to take action to carry out the deregistration of the unions if they did not toe the line.

It was interesting that Mr Dans criticised that sort of statement and said that he thought it was a little early for deregistration. I must agree that he made that statement personally; but he still made a statement which was embarrassing to the Industrial Commission when he said it was early days for deregistration. In other words, he said that the Industrial Commission had gone off too early. That is a criticism of the Industrial Commission and of Mr Commissioner Fielding who made that decision, difficult as it may have been.

Hon. Mark Nevill: Who is Commissioner Fielding? Where did he come from?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: He is a Federal commissioner.

Hon. D. K. Dans: A Federal commissioner! Government members interjected.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I am sorry. Commissioner Fielding is a State Commissioner. Mr Dans is reported as having made the following Press release—

The Minister for Industrial Relations, Mr Dans, who met representatives of the nine unions yesterday, said that he was also perturbed by the move.

"I am not very happy personally with what seems to be a hasty rush into deregistration," Mr Dans said after the meeting.

He did not believe that deregistration would solve the problem.

"However, that's a matter before the courts and I am expressing a personal opinion," he said.

Hon. Peter Dowding: A pretty measured and sensible remark.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: He is a Minister of the Crown. He is responsible to the State and to the people, and he gave a personal opinion which was critical of the State Industrial Commission. That is irresponsible. When that sort of comment is made, how could one blame some of the more militant groups for taking the action that they did? The Minister has shown bias in his comments and activities. He has shown a lack of understanding of the deregistration system, and he has been criticised by commissioners for that.

Of course, the Minister is biased in one way, and that is based on his experience. We can understand that, because he has been in one area only. He cannot understand the problems of the other side.

The track record of the first three months of the Minister's term of office is very bad indeed.

Hon. Tom Stephens: He is an excellent Minister.

Hon. P. H. Lockyer: You think that is a smart response, Mr Stephens.

Hon. Peter Dowding: We think the Minister's performance has been excellent. If you had been in power, we would have had a national strike.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Let us look at the record of the Minister, the record of which the members are so proud. In the first three months of his term of office, the Minister criticised the Industrial Commission, embarrassed the commission, and encouraged activities that he should not have encouraged. He made a statement on a personal basis that no Minister should make.

In the first three months of the Minister's term, the time lost on industrial disputes was 44 500 man days. That occurred from March to May of

this year. I cannot obtain the figures for the recent period, although the Minister may have them. What are the figures for this Government which said it would create harmony?

Hon. D. K. Dans: I am just looking at your figures for the last few months in office.

Hon. Peter Dowding: You would be embarrassed.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: In the previous three months, December to February inclusive, 20 100 man days were lost. In the three months before that, 30 200 were lost. From June to August 1982, 34 900 man days were lost. However, between March and May of this year 45 500 man days were lost. That does not take into account the recent disputes or the figures for August and September of this year. Those figures will be at an astronomical level. The Government does not have a good record. The Minister cannot produce evidence of his own figures to show why his members should be proud of him.

I shudder to think what will happen when we produce the current figures. It is two months since we received figures. They will show the most chaotic situation in years. I have no doubt about that.

Hon. D. K. Dans: How many years?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: In recent years. I know that Mr Dans will say that we had an 11-week stoppage when we were in power; but I am talking—

Hon. D. K. Dans: What do you mean, one for 11 weeks?

Hon. A. A. Lewis: It is remarkable that in this State—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: In the six months he has been in office, the Minister has been second to none in bad industrial relations. We have disputes in the Pilbara and at CBH, but we have heard not a single statement from the Government or the Minister criticising the people responsible for those disputes.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Who is responsible? You only look at one side.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Will the Minister make a statement of condemnation?

Hon. Peter Dowding: What will that do? That will only inflame the dispute, like you used to.

Opposition members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: As far as I can see, the Minister did not even make a request for the men to return to the job. I have searched the records,

and not one request was made by the Minister saying, "Please go back to work and then let us sort things out". He has not said, "Let us begin to talk. We do not support the 35-hour week". The Minister has not condemned the workers for that. He has not asked them to go back to work. He has not made a positive statement.

Hon. D. K. Dans: You pre-judge things. That is why you are sitting over there. Even the Confederation of Western Australian Industry recognised you for what you are.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: Running away from it.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: It is a great pity that the Minister should have said, in his own words, "Don't obey the commission". I have proved exactly what happened, and why these problems are occurring. By upsetting and embarrassing the Industrial Commission, the Minister has encouraged the people to disobey the commission. No-one can deny that.

The Government says one thing and means another. We have heard many interjections; if the Minister stands up he will make all sorts of excuses. Everyone can see the effect of what is happening.

It is interesting that the local members have not seen fit to say anything in this House about the return to work. We have heard no requests, no promises, nothing.

I made a suggestion for a combined meeting of the unions, and some people in the community were considering that suggestion. They were told that certain people were gutless. I urge the Minister to make sure that when that sort of comment is made, he considers it and draws it to the attention of the trade union movement to find out if the statement is correct. The Minister has better contacts with the trade union movement than I have, so all he has to do is pick up the phone and ask if the statement is correct. Had he done that, the dispute would have been settled long ago.

The Minister and his party have not cared about the many thousands of people who are suffering misery and loss at this time. It is not only the workers, but also their wives and children who are suffering. I cannot understand how the Government can pursue its present line and still keep its head above water.

The Pilbara strike is now in its tenth week. The first report we received was on 6 August this year. The group at Hamersley were pressing for a 35-hour week, and the Minister said that he did not support a reduction below 38 hours. However, the company stated publicly that it would consider and discuss the 38-hour week.

The dispute occurred, and still the Minister did not say, "You have your 38 hours. Go back to work". He said nothing at all. It is interesting that Mr Dans' good friend, Jack Marks, said, in effect, "The companies can afford it. They are making increased profits now".

The profit on the investment is 6 per cent; that is the maximum and that is the best it has been for a long time. How could anyone expect any company or group, even the Government members themselves, to invest money at 6 per cent these days? People would not dream of doing it. However, it seems a company is expected to act as soon as it earns 6 per cent; it seems that is considered to be a big profit.

We all know the reason for the dispute at Mt. Newman—it involves apprenticeship problems. The dispute at Hamersley involves a reduction in hours.

The figures given to us in our local newspapers are quite disturbing, to say the least. The following is a quote from *The Australian* of 13 August 1983—

Production losses amounted to 80 000 tonnes of ore a day and the total loss to the company of each day of the rolling strike was \$1.6 million.

This relates to just one company and it has been going on for almost 10 weeks. It is unbelievable that any group of people or any Government could sit idly by and allow this to happen.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Your Government did it for 11 weeks.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I say again that we have a Minister who said he would solve these problems, yet he has done nothing.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! When the Chair calls for order members know that that is a message for everyone other than the member who has the floor to keep quiet. I am becoming quite concerned at the apparent total disregard for the Chair shown by some members. I certainly do not want to take any further action, but I can assure members that unless they are prepared to take notice of my call for order they will leave me with no alternative.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I had made the comment that the Industrial Commission had made a direction, and I quote again as follows—

The dispute has been to the State Industrial Commission which has ordered the unions to stop disruptions.

The Industrial Commission gave a direction that the unions should cease this stoppage and go back to work, the men should do their job, and it would sort out this problem in its time. However, the unions disregarded that direction. Later, Commissioner Fielding had no alternative other than to threaten deregistration proceedings, because the unions had blatantly disregarded the commission's directions. The obvious step was for deregistration proceedings to be considered.

It is unfortunate that the Minister made his statement, even on a personal basis. That is the sort of problem we are facing. I wonder what future the Industrial Commission has, what future our industrial arbitration system has, if this sort of response is forthcoming from the people involved. If a State Government does not stand up and back its Industrial Commission, we may as well not have an industrial arbitration system at all. If the umpire makes a direction and the people responsible in the Government do not back up that direction publicly—that is not getting involved—what will happen to the system? It must be supported. All the Government need do is to say that it supports the commission and so should the unions.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: Why didn't you support it when you were Minister?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I did. There was not one time when, as Minister, I publicly criticised the commission. I urged all parties to follow its directions.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: You would ring at two in the morning.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: If the member is able to produce proof of that I would be happy for him to table it in the House. I say with all sincerity that if the industrial system is to continue in this State and Federally, the commissions must have the support, and be seen to have the support, of Governments of whatever political colour.

By this Government's not giving that support, by this Minister's embarrassing the commission, all that is being done is that the unions are being patted on the back, the militant groups responsible for these stoppages are being patted on the back and told to carry on because their activities do not bother the Government.

[Resolved: That motions be continued.]

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I was interested to read the following report in *The Australian* of 29 August dealing with the Pilbara disputes—

"But this is going to be a long-term campaign," Mr Krygsman said.

"So we are not going into an all-out strike situation. If we are stood down, we can get the dole."

It seems that the attitude of these people is that as long as they can get some payment they do not care who suffers or who bleeds.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Did they get the dole?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I do not know. But that is the attitude they have adopted. That attitude does no-one any good, least of all Mr Dans' party and especially Mr Dans himself.

Hon. D. K. Dans: They did not get the dole.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Early in September a group of Japanese business people visited the Pilbara. I am sure what they saw and what our overseas competitors know they saw would have given our competitors, such as Brazil, great encouragement. It was an embarrassment for the companies and the people of this State to think that representatives of our major trading partner were visiting the north to look at these projects and seeing that no work was being done, or very little. Some areas have been operating, but I am now talking about the operations hit by strikes—Hamersley and Mt. Newman.

In years gone past it was possible to consider that this sort of activity would take place. One would have thought that the people whose livelihoods depended on these markets would have shown their best endeavours to get back to work. We would have expected the State Government to criticise them and urge them to get back to work, especially as they have received a direction from the Industrial Commission. All the Government said was that it would talk to the unions and discuss the matter with the employers to tell them there was a light at the end of the tunnel.

A report in *The Weekend Australian* of 10-11 September dealt with our loss of markets and the redirection of shipping. I am sure this report caused a great deal of concern to us all. I quote as follows—

ANGRY Japanese steel makers are diverting carriers from West Australian ports hit by long-running strikes and have drawn up emergency plans to switch to other iron ore supply countries, notably Brazil.

Further on—

But in the long term the whole iron ore industry worth \$1 400 million a year in export income will suffer as Japan hurries forward its divert-from-Australia program.

We cannot turn our backs on this sort of thing; we cannot ignore it and expect it to go away. The only thing going away are the ships from our coast; our overseas markets; and our jobs. We will have less produce to sell and we will have fewer markets. We are heading for a major disaster.

I asked the Minister about this matter during a debate and he said he would check it. He did not come back to me on the matter; he probably did not check it. I wonder why the Government has not made some form of statement. I know the problems and the reasons for them, and the irreparable damage that will be done to one of our major industries.

A number of other newspaper cuttings exist, of course, but I will not quote from them. They deal with the subject of ships being diverted to India and Brazil. It all adds up to this: the situation is getting worse, we are losing sales and markets, and two weeks ago we lost 3.5 million tonnes of iron ore shipments to overseas competitors.

Hon. D. K. Dans: And production.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The Pilbara strike is very serious. The Opposition is very concerned about this matter. I would have thought the public would demand that the Government make some sort of firm statement on this matter, but they have not done so to date. As a result of this debate, we hope the Minister will not get up and make bland statements that the ships will come back tomorrow or that the ships will come back at some time. We know they will not come back. Let us hear some honest talk.

Hon. D. K. Dans: You know the ships won't come back, do you? Have you spoken to the Japanese shipowners? I have.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The Minister will stand up in a few minutes' time and say they will all come back once the strike ends and that we have not lost anything. That is utter stupidity.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I can speak for myself. Don't say anything so ridiculous.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: We will continue to lose markets. If the Minister buries his head in the sand and says they will all come back as soon as the work starts, he is fooling himself. He is like an ostrich.

Hon. Mark Nevill: You have told him what he cannot say.

A member: Get back in your cage!

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I want to talk also about the CBH dispute. This is only a recent dispute compared with the Pilbara one, but it is also very serious and is causing great concern to the community. Farming is one of the two major in-

dustries in Western Australia. We have discussed the iron ore industry and we will now talk about the farming industry in the rural sector. We have not seen the Government comment criticising the action that has been taken in respect of CBH.

Surely to goodness the Government must know the facts. The company has not considered the log of claims that is before it. I will read from the log of claims so it is on record and so we fully understand what is happening and that CBH has had no alternative but to take the steps it has taken. It is headed "Message to CBH Shareholders" and was published in yesterday's newspaper. It reads as follows—

The WWF's remuneration claims are very extensive and include:

- Paid stop-work meetings;
- 5 weeks annual leave;
- Leave loading of 27½%;
- Increased meal money;
- Increased overtime rates;
- 19 day month, 36 hours per week;
- Extensive redundancy provisions;
- Waterside Workers rates of pay as soon as possible;
- Spare men to relieve operators going to toilet.

Let us get back to the issue of a 19-day month or 36-hour week. We would have thought that the State Government would come out and say, "Go back to work. That is not on. We don't agree to that at all". I do not believe the Government has uttered a single word, and so the shareholders of the company and the company itself are suffering accordingly. The pressure is on.

I want to make the point and to have it recorded in *Hansard* that in another place a senior Minister made a most disgraceful attack on a member of this House. He made an attack on that person because, as the Chairman of CBH, he made a statement under the privilege of Parliament which he certainly could not make outside. This Minister is known as an agitator and a saboteur himself.

Withdrawal of Remark

Hon. D. K. DAns: I ask for that remark to be struck from the record. The Hon. David Parker is no agitator or saboteur. That is a disgraceful statement and one which is very low for even this member to make.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. John Williams): I ask the honourable member to withdraw the remark.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I agree to withdraw the remark.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

Hon. Lyla Elliott: Absolutely disgraceful!

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. A. A. Lewis: You can't take it.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I have already taken the action required of me by the Leader of the House. There is no need for any further interjections on that matter.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I was talking about a personal attack on a member of this House by a senior Minister in another place. I did not mention his name at all.

Hon. Lyla Elliott interjected.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The person concerned was involved in the building industry and was partly responsible for some of the concrete pour stoppages in this State when he was on the job. We can make our own decisions as to how we regard that person.

Hon. Garry Kelly: Mr Masters, do you think—

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. Garry Kelly: Do you think writs should be issued like CBH has done?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Such an attack on an honourable member in this House who is Chairman of CBH, in which he was accused of organising the CBH dispute for political gain, is disgraceful.

Hon. Garry Kelly: Being locked out, you mean?

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I remind the House once again of what the President stated earlier this afternoon. The House will come to order and will listen to the Hon. Gordon Masters, who has the floor.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The comment was made that it was locked out. A public advertisement in today's newspaper reads as follows—

CBH has not locked out its striking men.

Hon. Garry Kelly: That does not make it true.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The article continues—

CBH has not locked out its striking grain handler employees at Kwinana. The men concerned are "off pay" because they will not work according to the reasonable requirements of CBH. The WWF had convinced them that industrial muscle and disruptive tactics are the way to win battles.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: It is a lockout. You take one side.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Returning to my statement, this action obviously was not taken for political gain by the Chairman of CBH and a member of this House—not in any way. That person has given a lifetime to the grain industry. I doubt if anyone in this State would be more responsible for the success of the wheat industry and its marketing and handling than the Hon. Mick Gayfer. That attack was despicable.

Hon. Garry Kelly: So he issues writs against individual workers; is that right?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Let us make it quite clear: the Hon. Mick Gayfer who, I repeat, has given a lifetime to the wheat industry and to the farmers of this State, has served this Parliament well. Had he wanted political gain I understand he could have accepted a ministry a number of years ago. On two occasions at least he was offered a ministry and he said, "No, I will carry on as I am".

Hon. D. K. Dans: He has no chance of getting it in this Parliament.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: We have to put the record straight. That sort of despicable attack, which the Minister is not prepared to make outside the House, is quite disgraceful. We should look at and record the true events of the CBH strike because the honourable member in another place made all sorts of statements on the rights and wrongs of the dispute. His statements were wrong and quite untrue. I have here the details which I intend to read and will certainly table for the House. They show the facts leading up to the CBH dispute. The document reads as follows—

Following a decision of 4th September, 1981, by a Full Bench of the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission granting to the Waterside Workers the right to represent Plant Operators employed by C. B. H. at Kwinana, a number of discussions have taken place between C.B.H. and the W.W.F. Those discussions resulted in wages increases of \$39.00 per week during 1982 together with increases in a number of allowances. Further conferences were held in Perth on 8th December, 1982, Sydney on 15th December, 1982, and Perth on 6th January, 1983. At these conferences the W.W.F. sought increases in wages and allowances. C.B.H.'s view was that such increases were prohibited by the Wage Pause Guidelines. The W.W.F. was invited to take their claims to the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. The W.W.F. declined to do so and instead commenced series of rolling strikes. It was only after pro-

ceeding in the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission convened in response to a request from C.B.H. not the W.W.F., that the W.W.F. agreed to submit their claims to the full bench of the Commission. On 4th March, 1983 those claims were dismissed by the Commission as being contrary to the wage pause guidelines.

Shortly before the conference on 6th January, 1983, the W.W.F. had been presented by C.B.H. with a draft of an award which C.B.H. suggested might be made by agreement in the Commission. Since that time further discussions have taken place about the content of that draft. Conferences were held in Perth on 23rd August, 1983, and 2nd September, 1983. At those conferences agreement was reached about a number of issues including, ironically as events have developed, a dispute settling procedure which involved the continuation of normal work while issues were submitted to the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission for determination.

A number of the other claims were in the view of C.B.H. contrary to the wage pause guidelines. There were some further claims pressed by the W.W.F. which C.B.H. considered but did not believe were warranted. The W.W.F. at the conference on 2nd September, 1983, was expressly and plainly told that C.B.H. would participate in any Conciliation or Arbitration proceedings in the Commission which the W.W.F. thought desirable as soon as those proceedings could be convened.

Through the series of disputes it has been CBH Ltd., and not the Waterside Workers Federation suggesting the use of conciliatory functions. It has been the WWF and not CBH which constantly has refused to initiate such proceedings. I have taken the trouble to place these things on record because they are the facts and the background to what is happening now. The statements and comments made in another place, as recorded in *Hansard*, are quite wrongly an attack on a person and it is unfortunate that the honourable member concerned has not been able to reply in regard to the matter.

I am very pleased that today an interim injunction was issued in support of CBH and the people on strike at Geraldton and Esperance have been told not to hinder the export of grain. How they will react to that, I do not know.

We must understand that there are seven ships on our coast at the moment with three more due.

It could cost up to \$5 000 or more per day per ship. This is not paid by the Government, but by the farmers themselves—the shareholders.

Hon. Garry Kelly: Are you saying that CBH has no blame in this dispute?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: What I have said is that I want recorded in *Hansard* a full report on the facts of the case. If the Hon. Garry Kelly has any doubts I suggest he—

Several members interjected.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I am not going to be interrupted by a person who does not represent his electors properly.

Several members interjected.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: With regard to lost markets in the industry, I understand that CBH received a phone call from a buyer in Malaysia yesterday. CBH was told by the buyer that he must have grain immediately and that he had a ship waiting at Geraldton that could not get out. The buyer said that if he could not get the grain immediately he would have to get it elsewhere. We cannot blame buyers going to more suitable suppliers.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Can you blame CBH?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I have given the facts of the case.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. John Williams): This is the last time that I will remind members about interjecting. I am backing up the Chair's ruling earlier this afternoon.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I am sorry that the Government is getting upset, but I need to make the points because they are important and should be on record. It is a direct reflection on the Government's industrial policies and performances over recent months, and as time goes on the situation will get worse.

The headline in today's *The West Australian* says it all: "Threat to steel pact—BHP". I quote from the article as follows—

The strike at the Mt Newman iron-ore mining operation in the Pilbara seriously threatens the BHP-Federal Government \$350 million plan to revive Australia's ailing steel industry.

That is the situation that applies in this State of Western Australia today. I have outlined the events leading up to what we read in the headlines of today's paper.

It is unfortunate that the Government is not performing well in any shape or form. It is unfortunate the Government has not seen fit to make

statements to encourage people to return to work instead of issuing the bland statements made by the Minister. The public are entitled to leadership and it is no good the Minister trying to fob us off by saying that things will be all right. They will not be all right as long as he does that. We are faced with the threat of losing overseas trade, and undoubtedly we will. We face the threat of closure of industries in some cases, and new projects are threatened. It is the weakness of the Government and the Minister's failure to address himself to these problems that have caused all the difficulties. Unless the Government is prepared to make a firm statement to back up the industrial arbitration system as it should, things will get worse.

I ask the Minister when he replies to give an assurance to the House that he will publicly support the decisions of the Industrial Commission. If the Minister is asked a question in this House as to whether he supports the findings of the Industrial Commission we want him to answer "Yes" and not "Maybe, the Government is looking at it". When we ask questions we have the right to a truthful and direct answer. We are fed up with the way the Minister, the Leader of the House, is handling his portfolio.

I commend the motion.

HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) (3.37 p.m.): It is incumbent upon me to reply to the rambling dissertation and diatribe of the Hon. Gordon Masters. Let me say from the outset that during the time he sat here handling industrial relations, or as the industry says, mishandling them, he did not gain one atom of respect.

This Government, prior to being elected, made commitments in a number of areas, and one was industrial relations. We said categorically that we would not try to solve industrial disputes in the media because they cannot be solved in the media. Even the Hon. Gordon Masters would have to agree with that. It is a difficult process to come to a decision whereby one may be able to use one's influence to bring a dispute to a successful conclusion. As Mr Masters probably knows, the Premier made a Ministerial statement in the other House to the effect that Mt. Newman workers are to return to work in the morning. The Port Hedland workers will meet at 10.00 a.m. tomorrow and they are expected to return to work. There is a stay of proceedings—if that is the term—of five days to allow those people who may have left the area to return to it. Because of the efforts of this Government in supporting the commission in all of its activities a commissioner will sit as a private arbitrator on Tuesday in

Perth. One of the terms of settlement is for that commissioner to give his decision on that day.

In a few moments I will tell Mr Masters, chapter and verse, how the dispute evolved. I point out to members that one of the greatest impediments to the solving of the Mt. Newman dispute was Mr Masters' brainwave of managerial prerogative.

Hon. G. E. Masters: You do not really mean that.

Hon. D. K. DANS: The facts of the matter are that we have excellent relations with the Confederation of Western Australian Industry and we have discussed this and other disputes with it ever since it got under way; we have been in constant contact with the companies involved, and I have gone further than that and sought the advice of the Minister for Trade; and I have also had direct communications through that Minister with the Trade Commissioner from Tokyo.

To say the Government is not doing its job is a little stupid; but that is not unusual, given the background of the Hon. Gordon Masters.

Hon. Peter Dowding: We warned him this would happen when he amended the Act last year.

Hon. D. K. DANS: The Government has gone further than that. It has discussed the matter with Mines and Metals which as Mr Masters would be aware is the body dealing with the industrial side of the mining industry and—

Hon. Mark Nevill: Haven't they disowned him yet?

Hon. D. K. DANS: —also with the president of Mines and Metal who came to see me the other day. Not one of those parties has seen fit to condemn the Government for its handling of industrial relations in this State and, in particular, the disputes involving both Hamersley Iron Pty. Ltd. and Mt. Newman Mining Co. Ltd. The Government went further and held discussions with the leading Japanese ship owners' representative who also happens to have strong family connections with the Mitsui company, which is a major shareholder in the Mt. Newman and Cliffs Robe River Iron Associates project.

Mr Masters speaks from a position of bias; his whole speech was loaded against the unions; unions this and unions that, as though the companies were lily white. The Japanese delegation and Japanese buyers and ship owners do not swallow that argument. They apportion blame correctly. When one looks at the Mt. Newman dispute and how it got under-way, despite the fact that the Federal Government is putting millions of dollars into BHP to save jobs, we see it began because three electrical apprentices asked for

another six months' work—a total of 18 months in all—in order that they may be able to obtain a "B"-class ticket, but were refused. If that is good industrial relations I will eat my hat.

I refer to the actual stoppage times; shipments from Port Hedland have been disrupted for approximately a fortnight, not the 10 or 11 weeks of the Hamersley dispute in 1979. The now Leader of the Opposition bleats about the Government's inactivity, yet at the time of the 1979 dispute he was Minister for Labour and Industry. In a few moments I will refer to the activities of the then Government in that dispute.

The then Opposition took a very active interest in the settlement of the 1979 dispute. I was there in the interests of Western Australia and Australia and I saw neither hair nor hide of the then Minister for Labour and Industry or the then Deputy Premier. Under the direction of the Trades and Labor Council, Mr Peter Cook was provided as a private arbiter, and the dispute was brought to a conclusion. The Opposition should not talk to me about responsibility and irresponsibility. This Government firmly supports the industrial arbitration system of this country and in particular this State's Industrial Commission. If the Opposition would like to know some of the activities of the previous Government it should refer to *Hansard* where its actions during its term in office are recorded; it sought to erode the Industrial Commission—

Hon. Garry Kelly: To wreck it.

Hon. D. K. DANS: —and to wreck it by constantly reducing its area of jurisdiction.

Hon. Peter Dowding: They had no faith in it at all.

Hon. D. K. DANS: No faith whatsoever; one has only to read the Bill brought in at that time to understand the truth of what I am saying. I say categorically that the Hon. Gordon Masters assisted us no end in getting into Government.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: You will assist yourself to get out of it.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: Not likely.

Hon. D. K. DANS: Not likely!

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.00 p.m.

Hon. D. K. DANS: I was dealing with the Opposition's abysmal history of handling industrial relations problems during its period in Government. I do not want to canvass that question for very long. If any member wants to go into the community he will find out the situation for himself. Industry at large was disgusted and horrified by the Liberal Party's handling of industrial disputes. This was caused not only by Mr Masters,

but also by other Ministers for Labour and Industry.

My Government does not use industrial relations as a political tool. We said that prior to the election, and I say it again today. I will not be swayed from the attitudes I have adopted. We cannot solve industrial relations problems by using the media. We get nowhere by boiling up emotions. At all times the emphasis must be on two things: the prevention and the settlement of disputes.

The Mt. Newman dispute is nearing its end because the Government used the tools available to it through the Industrial Commission, despite the impediment of the existing legislation. I did not personally resolve the dispute, the apparatus of the Industrial Commission—there are many such apparatus—was used, and we are now on the eve of settlement of that dispute. I am sure that could have been accomplished earlier in the dispute if we had not had the existing Act. Be that as it may, the position is as I have put it.

Much has been said about iron ore shipments, etc., and I have outlined to the Chamber the contacts the Government has had in regard to this matter.

I ask the Chamber to let me make a thumbnail sketch of the Hamersley dispute. Mr Masters said it was the worst dispute in years, and I asked him by way of interjection why he thought that was so.

The Hamersley dispute commenced on 24 May 1979. The Hon. Ray O'Connor was the then Minister for Labour and Industry. The dispute involved 2 300 employees, and the then Government intervened on 31 July 1979. By that time the dispute had been resolved, and if members do not accept what I say, I suggest they read the transcript of the comments made by the Chief Industrial Commissioner. The dispute lasted just over 10 weeks, and the then Government's only claim to fame was its frothing at the mouth, which is exactly what Mr Masters did today. The then Government condemned the unions without having the common sense to consider both sides of the dispute.

Inevitably disputes must be resolved, and even with the existence of industrial commissions and all the other apparatus, the two parties to a dispute are, in reality, the only people who can settle the dispute. All that people opposite can do is yell and scream and belt the tub about left-wing unions, Communist unions, irresponsible unions, and all other such things.

After the Hamersley dispute was over the then Government intervened and decided to do what

has been done recently in respect of the CBH dispute; that was, to take civil action. I have the files which no doubt Mr O' Connor had at the time of the Hamersley dispute, and no doubt were available to Mr Masters as well. The Crown Law Department advised the Government against taking civil action.

Hon. Peter Dowding: What an embarrassment for them.

Hon. D. K. DANS: It was a embarrassment as well as an indication of the then Government's incompetence. It was the first time in history that someone intervened in a dispute after it had been settled. This Government wants to improve industrial relations in this State, and we are steadily doing that.

I will relate our actions taken through the commission; they are well documented. The main parties to the Pilbara dispute are quite happy with the Government's handling of it. I would say we have gone further than anyone to seek information and obtain confirmation of what has happened. After my term in this office, and after Mr Master's presence in this House, there will follow other Ministers responsible for industrial relations. I assure them, just as I assure this Chamber now, that industrial problems cannot be solved in the manner advocated by Mr Masters.

Part 1 of his letter states—

Has adopted a policy of buying industrial peace at any price in dealing with its own employees which policy has by example had an effect on the non-government sector;

Not one shred of evidence is available to confirm that comment. I have discussed this matter with a representative of the Confederation of Western Australian Industry, who is quite happy with the manner in which the Government has proceeded.

I turn now to the fourth part of the letter because it relates to the first. Part 4 states—

has submitted to the unhealthy influences of highly paid and biased Ministerial Advisers leading to a very serious lack of Government credibility in Industrial Relations;

I do not know who wrote this material, but he must be a colourful person.

I do not know how Mr Masters can sit here with a straight face. He would be the most biased person I have ever come across.

Hon. G. E. Masters: That is not true.

Hon. D. K. DANS: Whenever Mr Masters rises to his feet he never admits that a problem exists, he merely rants and raves about unions.

The credibility of our Government in the field of industrial relations is regarded by industry and unions as higher than that of any other Government in the last 25 or 30 years. Members need only to go out into the community to find that out for themselves.

Hon. G. E. Masters: We have.

Hon. D. K. DANS: I know members opposite have been talking to some of the people they like to represent.

Hon. Garry Kelly: Such as Midland Brick.

Hon. D. K. DANS: That is an excellent interjection. Members opposite should talk to the real people; they will tell members opposite the truth. In adjusting the wage rates for blue collar workers we took the advice of the best advisers in this State. I have excellent advisers; they are the officers of the Western Australian Government Industrial Relations Service. None of those wage rates was adjusted except on the recommendation of that service.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Will you give us the details?

Hon. D. K. DANS: The member should not worry about those details; they are under way now.

Hon. G. E. Masters: It has taken three months.

Hon. D. K. DANS: When I am ready I will give them to the member. I adopted and acted upon the advice given to me, as it was given to the previous Minister.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Shame on him!

Hon. D. K. DANS: He was not prepared to accept that advice. We made adjustments in wages which were sadly behind the wages of others and the generally accepted standards of this State. What Mr Masters proposed to do was to keep blue collar workers as far down as he could. One does not need a great imagination to understand what would have happened if that situation continued. We would have had a wage pause while the majority of Government blue collar workers were X number of dollars behind the generally accepted community standard of wages. The chances of the accord holding would have been diminished.

Certainly it is wrong to say that we submitted to unhealthy influences of highly paid ministerial advisers. The advice I took was the best advice available. The same people tried to advise the Hon. Gordon Masters, but he was too thick to take that advice.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Did you get some options? If you did, which option did you take?

Hon. D. K. DANS: I took the option which was the final recommendation of those officers.

Hon. G. E. Masters: I have the recommendations here.

Hon. D. K. DANS: It does not matter what the member has there. I took the option which was the recommended option of those officers. We have heard not one word from the Confederation of WA Industry; its members have known what we are doing.

I turn now to the second point which seems to get up Mr Masters's nose. I could have made myself the most popular person in the world at Trades Hall by saying, "As of today I grant those people \$3 a week". One of the reasons we did not make public announcements of that nature is quite simple. We should not raise the expectations of the work force. If we did that this State would have real problems.

We made adjustments for legitimate wage deficiencies which had been caused by the inactivity of the previous Government. I make no secret of our position, and I am very proud of the fact that our Government has been able to bring these people into line with the rest of the community in order that we may get some orderly approach to wage fixation. I make the point again that not one person in the private sector has seen fit to condemn our action, and that is because the private sector has been fully informed at every turn of the wheel, such as in the case of the Mt. Newman and Hamersley disputes.

The second part of the letter states—

has failed to take any positive stand in support of the Industrial Commissions . . .

The public repudiation by the previous Government of the Industrial Commission is expressed by the existing Industrial Arbitration Act. On every occasion something happened of which the previous Government did not approve, it brought the Act into this place for amendment. I am sure that when some people from the Industrial Commission finally reach retirement they will put on public record what they thought of the previous Government. It was a Government which constantly interfered with and harassed the commission in the carrying out of its functions.

Hon. G. E. Masters: That is not true.

Hon. D. K. DANS: It is true. That is not just the opinion of the commission, but also the opinion of everyone in this State who has had anything to do in the industrial relations arena.

Several members interjected.

Hon. D. K. DANS: I invite members opposite to attend a function I will put on for the captains

of industry. Members opposite can speak to those people to put their case, but they will have to make sure they do not get tarred and feathered. What members opposite say is just eyewash. If I did not have the respect I have for the Hon. Gordon Masters, I would have to say that when I read this letter I thought it had been written by a madman, an idiot, or both. It does not make sense. The nub of the letter, is the view of the Opposition towards industrial relations, as represented by part 3 of the letter. This relates to why Mr Macphree will end up as the Federal Leader of the Opposition—he has some brains.

Several members interjected.

Hon. D. K. DANS: The third point states that the Government has refused to make any positive statement condemning those responsible for the very serious dispute, thus giving encouragement to more militant unions. One of the things that one does not do in any industrial disputation is to introduce hysteria. I might say that one of the worst things that has happened to industrial disputes in the last few years is that mention of them has been brought from page 13 of the newspaper, where they used to be, to page 1 or 2. The worst problem is the electronic media. One should not give disputes the importance they do not deserve. On many occasions it occurs because people want to jump in front of television cameras and make statements about disputes as often as they can.

We are not doing anything different from that promised during the election campaign. We do not want articles about disputes on the front page of the paper and we are going about this effectively. If that had not happened we would be merrily on our way to a dispute with Mt. Newman that would be more serious than the previous dispute at Hamersley in 1979. In the case of the present Hamersley dispute there has been no serious disruption to shipping as yet.

Nevertheless, certain actions are taking place in the Hamersley dispute and it would be better if they were not taking place. When the Hamersley dispute goes before the Full Bench of the Industrial Commission tomorrow, notwithstanding the limited powers the commission has, I am hopeful that the dispute will be brought to a conclusion. I think every member in this Chamber would agree with me that that is the result we need. Condemning me, or condemning the unions, is certainly not endeavouring to resolve the dispute. I have gone through the four points and I refer to the following part of the motion—

...the Government must accept a heavy responsibility for the continuance of the current series of industrial stoppages.

The Government accepts no responsibility—

Hon. G. E. Masters: I thought you would say that.

Hon. D. K. DANS: —for the dispute in the first instance and we accept no responsibility for its continuance. We have accepted the responsibility of trying to bring a settlement to the dispute and we are doing that very effectively.

Let us look at the overall situation in the Pilbara, and this is something to which the Government will address itself in the near future. We have a ready-made prescription for industrial disputation in the Pilbara. Goldsworthy Mining Ltd., has had a 38-hour week for some time, as has Cliffs Robe River Iron Associates. Hamersley has not, but there has been a dispute about it and Mt. Newman Mining has not talked about it. We have four iron ore companies in that region and they cannot get their act together to have some form of unity. Even people who know nothing about these matters—

Hon. A. A. Lewis: Like the Minister for Industrial Relations.

Hon. D. K. DANS: —would have to concede that that is a sure prescription for disaster. We will be addressing ourselves to that problem in the not-too-distant future.

I go back to the first point I mentioned a few moments ago, which refers to the prevention of industrial disputes. One can do only two things: Prevent them or settle them. We hope that we can operate in that area more effectively than has been done in the last nine years.

This Government is fully aware of the problems confronting the nation and we are fully aware of the problems concerning Western Australia in particular because of the continuation of the stoppage in the north-west. In the case of the Mt. Newman dispute I have not encountered so much public support compared with other disputes in the last 15 years. I am serious about that. People have been drawn into the Hamersley dispute who normally would not be drawn in.

It is about time we had some better dispute settlement procedures in the north-west. Mr Lewis would know what I mean when I say I would like something similar to the Collie Coal Mining Tribunal operating in the north-west. There are some difficulties in realising that aim.

Hon. G. E. Masters: I thought you were going to get rid of that.

Hon. D. K. DANS: I never said I would get rid of it. The Government does not accept any of the criticism of the Hon. Gordon Masters. His speech

was simply a diatribe of half truths and it lacked facts.

I do not want to weary this Chamber but I must react to the fact that all the normal things that should have been done when Mr Masters was Minister were not done. Mr President, through you to Mr Masters, I would like to read the history of the Mt. Newman and Hamersley disputes. It reads as follows—

On Monday July 25, 1983 110 members of the Electrical Trades Union went on strike over Mt Newman's refusal to meet their demands for the company to guarantee at least 6 months work for all apprentices when they have completed their apprenticeships.

At that time, there were three. It continues—

The graduated apprentices to be paid at tradesmens wage rates. Mt Newman's initial response was that the demands would not be met as it was a matter for managerial prerogative.

That is a tricky provision that the Hon. Gordon Masters put in the Act. I suppose we should call this the "Gordon Masters stoppage" and perhaps he will go down in history as having inadvertently caused a stoppage.

Hon. G. E. Masters: You do not believe that.

Hon. D. K. DANS: Of course I believe it; all this can be contributed to the Hon. Gordon Masters.

Hon. Lyla Elliott: We are getting to the truth now.

Several members interjected.

Hon. D. K. DANS: The words "managerial prerogative" really had people in the commission worried. They did not know how to get around them. The history continues—

Following unsuccessful talks with the company on Tuesday July 26, 1983 the Electrical Trades Union members met on Wednesday July 27, 1983 and voted to continue their strike indefinitely.

Mining and railing iron ore ceased at the Newman mine site on July 25, 1983 and has not recommenced.

That does not mean the ore ships are not running. It continues—

On July 29, 1983, arising out of a conference before Commissioner Fielding of the Western Australian Industrial Commission, the striking Electrical Trades Union members were directed to return to work no later than August 1, 1983. At a further conference on Monday August 1, 1983, Commissioner

Fielding issued a Section 45 Order to return to work by 6.30 a.m. on Wednesday August 3, 1983.

On August 2, 1983 140 Amalgamated Metal Foundry and Shipwrights Union (AMFSU) members went on strike at Newman in support of the Electrical Trades Union.

Therefore, when the order was issued, instead of stopping the strike it unfortunately extended it. It continues—

On Wednesday August 3, 1983 ETU and AMFSU members voted to remain on strike indefinitely. From this point the ETU was acting in defiance of a Western Australian Industrial Commission return to work order. From Thursday August 4, 1983 standdowns at the mine site and of railway crews began. Shipping was continuing from stock piles but was subject to rolling strikes from the Australian Workers Union (AWU).

I am referring to the "Gordon Masters' strike". It is the one that he put in operation when he used the words "managerial prerogative". Not many people can go down in the history books as having a strike named after them.

Several members interjected.

Hon. D. K. DANS: If I repeat it five times I will be like the Hon. Gordon Masters, who repeats things 10 times. The comment continues—

On Friday August 5, 1983 ETU members at Port Hedland joined the strike in support of ETU and AMFSU members at Newman. The ETU at Port Hedland returned to work on Saturday August 6, but went on strike again on Friday, August 12, 1983.

When the Hon. Gordon Masters says that nothing is being done, what he means is that we are not foaming at the mouth and condemning the dispute. The companies believe that a great deal of progress has been made in the Pilbara in the last couple of years by the unions and management in respect of industrial disputes. It is unfortunate that the Hon. Gordon Masters used the term "managerial prerogative" because it stood in the way of having the dispute settled. The history continues—

On September 12, Mt Newman declared force majeure on its contracts as it could no longer ship ore.

On August 18, 1983 a conference held before Commissioner Fielding at which the company put proposals to the unions involved. The Company offered to give graduating apprentices six months work at

tradesmens rates for those who had been a maximum of four years total time with the company. However, they would be employed in a surplus capacity and not as tradesmen. A meeting of ETU and AMFSU members on Friday August 19, rejected the offer and remained on strike.

The problem as I understand it is that the workers at Mt. Newman were seeking to obtain the same conditions of employment as those workers working at Hamersley, Cliffs Robe River; and Goldsworthy. Unfortunately if one couples the attitude of BHP at Mt. Newman with Mr Master's "managerial prerogative" exercise we get this type of dispute. BHP, which I have dealt with over the years, is obsessed with not having something in one area which might flow free like a flood. However, in my experience and that of trained industrial observers, nothing that has happened in the iron ore industry has by and large travelled through BHP.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: Oh, Mr Dans!

Hon. D. K. DANS: I said "the iron ore industry". I ask Mr Lewis to give one example that has gone through and ended up in the works at Newcastle and Port Kembla.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: Are you dinkum? How long a list would you like?

Hon. D. K. DANS: I ask the member to tell me now off the top of his head.

To return to my remarks—

Hon. P. H. Wells: Who are you quoting?

Hon. D. K. DANS: I am not quoting; it is my own record. To continue—

Negotiations between the company and the unions have occurred since 19 August, 1983. The unions rejected an offer from the Company to have the matter settled by private arbitration.

That is exactly what we are going to do now. To continue—

Since September 14, 1983 the entire operations of Mt Newman closed down, with workers either on strike or standdown.

On September 21, 1983 Mt Newman requested the Western Australian Industrial Commission to hear and adjudicate on the dispute. A hearing before Commissioner Collier began at 9.30 a.m. on Friday, September 23, 1983. The Western Australian Industrial Commission will have to consider firstly whether the dispute relates to an industrial matter as per the definition in the Industrial Arbitration Act 1979-82.

I ask Mr Masters whether he is listening. To continue—

If the Western Australian Industrial Commission finds it has no jurisdiction, the Attorney-General can consider the possibility of using Section 7(g) of the Industrial Arbitration Act—

Mr Masters knows what that is; he wrote it. To continue—

—to refer the matter back to the Commission who can declare the matter to be an industrial matter if this is desirable under the objects of the Act or is desirable in the public interest.

Hon. Neil Oliver: You did a far better job when you didn't have an adviser.

Hon. D. K. DANS: Advisers play no part in this arena. I have already outlined that I have the best possible officers in that area—the officers of the Western Australian Government Industrial Relations Service. I would be foolish not to take their advice.

Hon. Neil Oliver: Why did you disagree with Mr Masters when he took the same advice?

Hon. D. K. DANS: Mr Masters never took their advice; I have outlined that. They were horrified with that; he went all the way to Alabama to get his advice.

The PRESIDENT: I spoke earlier about interjections and I asked the Leader of the House not to continue to have discussions with other members. He ought to be directing his comments to the Chair, and that perhaps will lessen the interjections.

Hon. D. K. DANS: You know, Mr President, I always try to do that. I always face you and rarely react to interjections. Sometimes it is very difficult to disregard them, particularly such educated ones coming from the Hon. Neil Oliver.

Hon. Neil Oliver: Just a moment; that is an unacceptable remark!

Hon. D. K. DANS: We will come to the Hamersley dispute, and I am trying to demonstrate that the Government has taken all the necessary steps, using the Industrial Commission. To continue with my record—

As from August 1, 1983, all unions at Hamersley Iron imposed rolling strikes in support of a 36-hour week.

Private talks have been held between the company and the unions concerned on numerous occasions during this dispute.

Conferences were held before Commissioner Fielding and arising from these

conferences in early August 1983, a return to work order was issued that workers return to work by midnight on August 10, 1983. The unions ignored the order and have maintained their rolling strike campaign.

The company's initial position was that it was prepared to negotiate for a 38-hour week, with trade-offs but anything less was out of the question. The unions position was for a 38-hour week immediately, with no trade-offs and agreement in principle from the company for a 36-hour week in 1984.

The Minister for Industrial Relations Mr Dans, had discussions with the union officials concerned on the dispute on August 17, 1983.

On August 31, 1983 the company requested a hearing before the Commission in court session on the dispute. Commissioner Fielding rejected the claim as it was considered premature to hold such a hearing because a deregistration hearing before the Full Bench was to be heard on 5 September as a result of consistent industrial action that has occurred in the Pilbara.

I pause briefly there because the Hon. Gordon Masters took me to task for making some comment in respect of deregistration proceedings. I firmly believe now what I said on that occasion, and a number of other people share my view.

The move into deregistration proceedings was a little premature. I hold that view now, and more strongly so. I did not condemn the commission for doing it. I thought a little more effort should have been made, but I did not at any stage challenge Commissioner Fielding's right to file the deregistration proceedings. We did not interfere with the proceedings and we did not intervene.

To return to the record—

By September 5, 1983 1,400 workers had been stooddown due to the rolling strikes.

On September 9, 1983 the Company offered a 38-hour week with trade-offs subject to approval by the Western Australian Industrial Commission. It also agreed to hold further discussions in mid-1984 for a further reduction in working hours. The company recalled all its stooddown workers on the same day for work.

That arose from a discussion I had with the company, which used the term "stand them up again". It is now a part of history that the workers rejected the company's offer. To continue—

As a result of a conference before Commissioner Fielding on Wednesday, September 15, talks were held between the company, union officials and convenors at Dampier on September 19. No progress was made at this meeting.

Commissioner Fielding referred the dispute to the Commission in court session on September 21. The matter is to be heard on September 29. The Hamersley Iron workforce remains at work; however loading at Dampier is continuing.

The Western Australian Industrial Commission (through Commissioner Fielding) issued summons against all nine unions involved in the two disputes on August 18, under Section 73 of the Industrial Arbitration Act to appear before the Full Bench on September 5 and show cause why they should not have their registrations cancelled or suspended.

The Full Bench on September 16 handed down its decision to cancel the registration of eight unions (Transport Workers Union was excluded) rights to enrol members in the Pilbara iron ore processing industry as from October 7, 1983 unless the unions;

- (1) satisfy the Full Bench that it recognises the obligations which it has under the Industrial Arbitration Act, 1979;
- (2) acknowledge and accept their responsibilities to meet those obligations; and
- (3) demonstrate such recognition and acceptance by ensuring that all directions and orders of the Commission in force and applicable to its members in the iron ore production and processing industry are being complied with.

The unions have indicated, today (September 23) that they will appeal the decision.

On September 2, 1983 a delegation of Japanese steel industry leaders visited Western Australia and toured the Pilbara iron ore sites at the height of the industrial disputes.

It could not have been a worse time. To continue—

Japanese steel companies have had to compensate some shipping companies for demurrage due to Mt. Newman declaring force majeure and ships are being diverted to India to meet the Japanese steel companies nominated shipping schedule for September. These lost sales cannot be made up when the dispute is settled.

It does not say they will not come again; they just cannot be made up. To continue—

The Government of Western Australia has not formally intervened in these proceedings as the Western Australian Industrial Commission is dealing with the disputes through the normal processes available to it, although as mentioned in reference to the Mt. Newman dispute, the Government may need to take some action if jurisdictional problems are encountered.

The Government on every occasion since the start of these two unfortunate disputes has worked through the Industrial Commission, and through the companies and the unions. It has seen fit to hold discussions with all parties involved in the iron ore industry, and on this occasion some parties who had never been approached before. The Government at all times has been properly advised on the problems confronting not only Australia, but Western Australia in particular. We take great exception to the fact that this motion seems to suggest the Government has done nothing to bring this dispute to an end. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. I will not say it is over forever and a day, but the fact is the Mt. Newman workers are going back tomorrow.

The great difference between our approach to industrial relations and that of the former Government is that we like to go "softly, softly" about it and try to bring about a settlement. The kind of eighteenth century approach of bash, bash, bash on the union door is the stock in trade of the Hon. Gordon Masters and it does not work any more.

I could be very critical—although I will not do so—of a company which says to its apprentices "Look, you have finished your time; we know you have six months to go to get your ticket, but you are not going to work here". Just down the track at Hamersley the company recognises that situation, as they do at Cliffs and at Goldsworthy. I could have criticised the Mt. Newman company no end, but it would not have done any good. I could have criticised the unions for not taking the advice offered by the Government. I could have criticised Hamersley Iron and said, "You are a mob of dodos; when Cliffs and Goldsworthy gave a 38-hour week you should have approached the unions then instead of waiting for this clash to come along. You should get together and get some uniformity of approach". However, that would not bring about a settlement of the dispute.

It is unfortunate that the Hon. Gordon Masters cannot disguise his hatred of unions. In my opinion this makes him very unsuited to be the

spokesman on industrial relations for the Opposition. In this area one has to exercise an even hand. I have never heard the honourable member on his feet saying anything nice about unions, notwithstanding that the two iron ore companies involved in this dispute have said to me, "We concede perhaps we have made some mistakes, but we want you to understand that in the last couple of years tremendous strides have been made by companies and unions in prevention and settlement of industrial disputes. We reject out of hand that it is all on one side".

When I spoke to the Japanese I came to the conclusion they knew more about what was happening in the Pilbara than the Hon. Gordon Masters and a lot of other people.

Hon. Mark Nevill: There is nothing surprising about that.

Hon. D. K. DANS: I am just putting it on the record. Those gentlemen did not apportion the blame all to the union side. They are very well informed. Irrespective of whose fault is the dispute, it is in our best interests not to make personal or political mileage out of it. Everyone should try in the first instance to get the dispute settled. We should then seek to put in place some system that will minimise considerably the chances of it happening again; I would be a brave person to say it could not happen again.

I will stack the record of this Government in handling this dispute, in this Chamber or in public, against the record of the previous Government in handling the last Hamersley Iron dispute. When I read the report of that dispute, I found that it was settled finally on the note that, with a little bit of endeavour, it could have been settled in the first or second week. That is not just my say-so; some people study this type of situation. We have come out of this smelling like a rose. If Mr Masters considers his approach in the earlier Hamersley dispute, he will find that it was quite different.

The conservative parties, particularly in this State Parliament, see a great deal of advantage to be gained from bashing the union can. They still have not received the message that that is now old hat and out of fashion. The people are not anxious to go on strike.

Like Mr Masters, I am concerned that the people and the nation lose in these strikes. It is unfortunate that in any kind of dispute the people who are hurt the most are the people who have been on strike. I am aware of that, and so, painfully, are the people who have been on strike.

We should have machinery to ensure that when disputes arise, they are nipped in the bud, hope-

fully as soon as possible. I have said in this Chamber, not once, but 100 times, that industrial relations is only another name for human relations.

A number of compounding factors exist in the Pilbara, and the Hon. Phil Lockyer would know that. The climatic conditions are a problem. A huge body of people from around Australia are huddled, in some cases, in company towns; and that places stress on the people. That is a factor which cannot be disregarded.

Because of the great interest of the Hon. Gordon Masters in industrial relations, he should read a very fine study done by Helen Court on the social consequences of living in the Pilbara. If he has not read it already, I recommend it to him. Although it may be a little dated, it is still as relevant today as it was then.

The people of the Pilbara are ordinary, decent, good Australians. They are aware of their responsibilities to the community. The companies are also aware of their responsibility. When disputes arise, we should not do anything to extend them. Rather, we should have machinery to ensure that they are resolved as soon as possible.

I do not wish to end on a bad note, but I will refer to the CBH dispute. I am fully aware of that dispute, and the Hon. Mick Gayfer would know of it as well. When he has come to me with a problem relating to CBH, we have been able to have amicable discussions about it. The CBH dispute will be resolved in the same way as the other dispute has been resolved.

I will not try to say what should or should not be done. The CBH dispute will be resolved by the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. It will be heard by Mr Justice Lockhart. I have not heard of him so far; Mr Gayfer could put me right on that. That is where it will be resolved. No amount of to-ing and fro-ing, or going around in the middle of the night, serving people with writs, or any kind of yelling and screaming by the Waterside Workers Federation or the company, or any other people, will do anything to bring that dispute to a conclusion. The Government of Western Australia is firmly committed to the arbitral process. It will do anything in its power to make it work. We do not intend to go public on every piddling dispute; and we do not intend to try to solve them through the media. I, for one, will not be swayed in my approach to industrial relations.

My stand on industrial relations is widely accepted and respected by all the people involved at present. I hope that the CBH dispute is resolved as quickly as possible for a range of reasons.

No-one gains from industrial disputation. No-one gains when we hear the kind of tripe dished out by the Hon. Gordon Masters tonight. I challenge everyone to read the transcript of his remarks and compare it with what appears on the piece of paper which purports to be some kind of motion.

Despite our so-called inactivity, and despite the activity that Mr Masters says we should be involved in, the fact of the matter is that, at least for the present, the Mt. Newman people are returning to work tomorrow. Despite the great hurdle of managerial prerogative put in the Act by Mr Masters, we have found a way around the problem. Hopefully, when the parties go before the commission tomorrow, they will solve the Hamersley dispute. None of these things is a fast operation, as the Hon. Gordon Masters knows.

On all occasions, I have taken advice from the people I consider to be the best advisers in this arena. I will continue to do so. More importantly, I will continue to apply the policy of my party, which is contained in the little book from which all members opposite are keen to quote.

Hon. P. H. Wells: Can I have a copy?

Hon. D. K. DANS: Yes. Copies are available for \$1 each. Mr Wells must be the only member in this Chamber who does not have one. Mr Pandal cuddles his copy like a teddy bear.

Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Do you classify the CBH dispute as piddling?

Hon. D. K. DANS: No, I do not. I said "any piddling dispute", but CBH is a major dispute. I did not include that.

Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: What sort of dispute do you class that as?

Hon. D. K. DANS: It is a major dispute; and Mr MacKinnon knows very well that it is. He is too wise to ask a question like that.

Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I just wanted you to put it on the record.

Hon. D. K. DANS: On page 4, item 2 of our policy document, the words "Co-operation between Government, employers and unions replaces confrontation" appear. That is our policy. We have been applying it, and we will continue to apply it. We will continue to have success. No amount of jumping up and down, abuse, and what the Hon. Gordon Masters has been displaying here today will achieve the success we have achieved. The record of the Hon. Gordon Masters is dreadful. Members should not ask me; they should go outside and ask the people in industry. The people outside will tell members all about the Hon. Gordon Masters. I rather like the gentle-

man, and it grieves me to hear the dreadful things people say about him.

Hon. P. H. Wells: Do you defend him?

Hon. D. K. DANS: I always defend him. I hope the Liberal Party keeps him around for some time because, while he espouses what he does, we will be in Government for a long time to come. Because of the activities of the Hon. Gordon Masters, it was possible for the Labor Party to collect hundreds of thousands of dollars from the people disenchanted by him.

I reject the motion.

HON. P. H. LOCKYER (Lower North) [4.53 p.m.]: I support the motion. All I can say after Mr Dans's speech is that the stage has been robbed.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I do not get the significance of that.

Hon. G. E. Masters: He said you should have been an actor.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I wish to deal with the forgotten victims of the Pilbara strikes. Many people do not work for the iron ore companies; they have chosen to go to the Pilbara to open businesses such as car yards, refrigeration businesses, electrical retail stores, newspaper shops, dress shops—all the small businesses that are so important to the economy of the State. Prior to coming into this place, I operated a small business in the Pilbara, so I know exactly what happens when an iron ore company is on strike. It is important that that should be brought to the attention of the House.

The big problem with strikes in iron ore companies is that nobody knows how long the strike will last. The consequence of that is that the people stop spending their money on anything other than essential day-to-day needs. The result is that the gentleman with the car business selling new and second-hand cars has an immediate drop in customers. I was in the insurance business, and once iron ore workers went on strike, it was a good idea to take holidays because the people immediately stopped buying insurance. The longer a strike goes, the worse the situation becomes.

I recently made a swift private visit to the Pilbara, and I found that the small business people were appalled at the situation. I agreed with the part of Mr Dans' speech in which he said that we should look for another way to solve the problem. No benefit is gained by political jumping up and down; the people on strike need some way to solve the problem.

The people in the Pilbara regard the Government as having the responsibility to take the lead.

Many people operating small businesses in the Pilbara are terribly disillusioned with the Government because it is not giving a lead in solving the strike.

Hon. Peter Dowding: That is where you are wrong. You do not have to have it in the newspapers.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Where do you have it?

Hon. Peter Dowding: Don't be silly. You did it in the newspapers, with disastrous results.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Have you done anything towards it?

Hon. Peter Dowding: Yes, actually—quite a deal.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I checked and I found that none of the local members had made an approach to either company. I do not know whether that is right or wrong; but I know that as far as the local members are concerned—

Hon. D. K. Dans: I just spoke to the managing director—

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I do not class Mr Dans as a local member. I have no doubt he did a very good job.

Hon. Peter Dowding: This is not information you have had from the company, because I had a meeting with it on the spot.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I return to the point I made earlier. I will disregard the interjections from people who should know better. It is amazing what a guilty conscience does to a member after a while.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Don't be pathetic. You are just telling untruths.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: The present system of prolonged strikes can only cause the people running vital businesses in the north to close up, because they will go broke. A number of people operating small businesses are already going broke.

I was approached by a young man who works for Mt. Newman Iron Ore Company Ltd., and who has been off work for seven or eight weeks because of the strike. Had it not been for the kindness of a finance company, Esanda Limited, this young man would have lost his car. He was advised by Esanda that his payments would be deferred until he went back to work. That will cause money worries for him later. Sooner or later the money will have to be repaid.

It takes months, if not years, for people to recover the money they have lost. That applies to the workers and the companies. The small business people have been affected badly.

In relation to air travel, I found there has also been a drop.

Hon. D. K. Dans: A dropping door or a drop in profits?

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I will deal with the last point during the adjournment debate tonight. I believe the people concerned did a good job in that incident.

It is amazing how people stop spending money on anything other than essential items. That sort of thing cannot go on. The strike in Port Hedland is regarded as a very bad one, and people all over the State have found it incredible that it should continue, seemingly without reason. I understand that the apprentices regard it as an important matter; but it is incredible that thousands of workers should be stood down because of this one problem.

Workers may consider industrial disputes to be acceptable because they are seen as their only weapon. However, people State-wide are shaking their heads over the industrial situation in the Pilbara.

I am delighted that Mr Dans has been able to tell us that the workers will go back tomorrow. What is driving them back? Perhaps it is empty pockets.

Hon. Peter Dowding: That talk doesn't help.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: That would be an enormous factor, because a person can go only so long without money. If my comments embarrass the Minister for Mines, I suggest that he should get back to his electorate and talk to some of the people.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Let the dispute be over and done with; let the men get back to work.

Hon. Tom Stephens: The only reason you are saying all this is that you want to win the by-election.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. John Williams): Order! The Hon. Tom Stephens will come to order. This debate will continue without interjections, provided the speakers do not become provocative.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: The most important thing we should learn from all this is that the time is now right for other steps to be taken, whether it be a round-table conference of all concerned or something else; but we cannot continue in the present way. The CBH dispute is another example where the State's reputation and the country's reputation is falling. Unless steps are taken to go in another direction, goodness knows what will happen.

The responsibility to take the lead falls squarely on the Government. If Mr Dans is sincere—I have no reason to believe he is not—now is the time for him to take action and perhaps even involve Mr Masters as well as the unions and the employers in an endeavour to sort things out. Things cannot continue as they are. Our industrial disputes are becoming an Australia-wide joke. Even though we are told by members opposite that the Japanese are not affected, I am sure no-one seriously believes that is the case. The time is right for a lead to be given, perhaps by Mr Dans, to change direction.

I support the motion.

HON. N. F. MOORE (Lower North) [5.03 p.m.]: I delayed standing in the expectation that one of the Minister's colleagues would rise to support his comments.

Perhaps someone else opposite has more experience in the field of industrial relations than someone like myself. I do not claim to have a great deal of expertise in this field.

Hon. D. K. Dans: No-one does.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I have never caused an industrial dispute. I have only momentarily been involved in one. However, on many occasions I have suffered because of one, as have many other people in Western Australia. An interjection earlier in the debate by a Government member indicated that it was almost necessary to have been a union official at some time in the past before one could speak on industrial relations and strikes.

My concern about industrial disputes is for those people who suffer as a result of them. I do not claim to know how we can prevent or solve industrial disputes.

Hon. D. K. Dans: We can only try.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I do not know whether anyone is in a position to do this. I do know many people in our community suffer in varying degrees because of industrial disputes, particularly prolonged strikes such as the ones we have experienced in the Pilbara over many years. Many people suffer: The workers lose pay; their wives and children have to put up with dad at home all day; there is less money for housekeeping and for meeting mortgage repayments; the small business people in the Pilbara towns who are not working for the mining company lose customers.

I am certainly concerned about disputes affecting our major resource-producing industries and the effect they have on the future economy of this State. There is no doubt that prolonged strikes

such as the ones we have had in the Pilbara are detrimental to the State's economy.

It is difficult to work out why these disputes continue, bearing in mind the difficult economic circumstances in which the country now finds itself and has done for some time. It is beyond reason that we should have prolonged industrial trouble at a time when our economy is in need of productivity and a concerted effort on everyone's behalf.

Hon. Peter Dowding: I take it you are not blaming one side?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I am not apportioning blame. I have no doubt that some industrial disputes are totally motivated by one side or the other. Regrettably, most have been motivated by the unions.

Hon. Peter Dowding: What is your evidence?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I have been here a long time hearing about industrial disputes. I know that some are purely political disputes.

Hon. Peter Dowding: You must belong to the flat earth society. This is just nonsense.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: We have seen the situation in the Pilbara, particularly where we have had strikes of a political nature. Unions have gone on strike because of demarcation disputes as well. We had the Noonkanbah dispute, and no-one can say the companies were involved in the disputes that arose over that issue; no-one can say the companies are involved in demarcation disputes. On many occasions, disputes are caused by one side. I can imagine that Hamersley Iron Pty. Ltd. and Mt. Newman Mining Co. Pty. Ltd. might not have been unhappy when some disputes have arisen and they have had excess stockpiles. However, in the six years I have been a member of this place I have heard many speeches made on the subject of industrial relations, particularly by Mr Dans because of his involvement and expertise, perhaps, in this matter.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I have never claimed to have had that. If you have it today you don't have it tomorrow.

The Hon. N. F. MOORE: I am saying that Mr Dans may have a particular understanding of industrial relations. During the six years I was a member of the Government, we were told how totally inept we were in the field of industrial relations and how, when the Opposition came to office, we could expect things to be quite different. We were always told that the Labor Party had, for some reason, a monopoly of knowledge which would allow it to prevent or solve industrial disputes. Those speeches are still ringing in my

ears. After six years I came to believe that perhaps members opposite were telling the truth.

Hon. Peter Dowding: You must have voted for us.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I was thinking that perhaps they did have some expertise or some special relationship with the union movement which would prevent industrial disputes from occurring or which would quickly solve any that arose. When I recall the situation of the Whitlam years, when I consider what is happening in NSW, and when I hear about "Wran's Navy" and the history of other Labor Governments in this field, I realise that in fact they do not have a great record of success, no better record than any non-Labor Government. In fact, I suggest Labor Governments have a worse record. I really did hope that when, regrettably, the then Opposition in Western Australia became the Government, it would have some success in the field of industrial relations, because all industrial disputes are detrimental to the economy and they should be avoided at all costs.

What this debate is all about is a comparison of what the Government promised when it was in Opposition and what it has actually been able to achieve. I have here the Australian Labor Party State election policy for 1983 and I would like to quote the first two paragraphs, because these were promises made prior to the 19 February election—

The Australian Labor Party has received widespread acceptance of the concise, practical and workable Green Paper on Industrial Relations which has been circulated throughout W.A. for many months.

The acceptance from industry, unions, some academics and others for the package demonstrated the ALP's long-held belief that it is the only party properly placed to handle this important area.

That is what the Premier said.

Hon. G. E. Masters: It doesn't seem to have worked out.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: When we change the Act we will be able to do it.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: The Government can change the Act when it gets the support of the Parliament.

The Labor Party said that because of its long-held belief, it was the only party that could handle this important area of industrial relations. If we recall all the things Mr Dans and other Government members have been saying over many years, we might be excused for believing that when the

Government came to office we would see a rapid diminution of industrial disputes and everything would be rosy in this area. Regrettably, as the Hon. Mr Masters has already listed, we have had many industrial disputes since 19 February.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: No more than you had.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Yes, there have been.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Mr Dans demolished your argument.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I have been talking about what the Government promised and what we expected it would deliver. I am not suggesting that industrial disputes during our time are something we can be proud of, but the point is that members opposite have constantly said that their party would be able to handle industrial disputes and that there would be no problem when they were in Government. The policy document of the Government contains words to that effect. Regrettably, since members opposite have been in Government, the Pilbara has witnessed some very severe industrial disputes.

Let us consider the ALP's promise in relation to the Pilbara. Mr Grill, the then Opposition spokesman for mines, made a clear statement about what people could expect from a Labor Government in relation to the iron ore industry. Mr Grill—regrettably, according to him—is now not Minister for Mines. This is another election promise the Labor Party has broken, because it promised that Mr Grill would be Minister for Mines.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Grow up, Moore; don't be absurd.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: The Minister is a little touchy.

Hon. Peter Dowding: You must be a member of the flat earth society.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. John Williams): Order! The Minister has a right to reply to the member.

Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: He makes up for a lack of attendance by the amount of noise he makes when he is here.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. N. F. MOORE: The shadow spokesman for mines, the present Minister for Transport, made several statements in October 1982 about what this State could expect in the event of the Labor Party gaining office. I quote now from the 16 October 1982 edition of *The Australian Financial Review*—

THE Labor Party in Western Australia will seek agreement from unions to avoid

strikes and will invite greater equity from Japanese interests in the iron ore industry to check the sharp fall in exports.

Further on—

The document says that government industry and unions should work out special agreements with emphasis on productivity and ensuring continuous production.

It goes on to explain that the Labor Party, then in Opposition, was very concerned about the situation in the Pilbara and that special steps would be taken to avoid industrial disputation for which the Pilbara has become infamous. It is interesting that in the first six months of the Government's coming to office the two major producers in the Pilbara have had strikes of very long duration. Mr Dans argued about six, 10, or 11 weeks, but the point is that anything over one week is a fairly long dispute.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Under which Act, your amended Act? We warned you what it would do.

Hon. G. E. Masters: What codswallop. You don't believe that.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Before coming into office, the Government promised industrial harmony. Now, with the problems of industrial disputation which have abounded since it took over power, members opposite have been arguing tonight about the Industrial Arbitration Act. They are the Government and they have the ability to bring to this Parliament amendments to that Act, if they do not think it is satisfactory.

Hon. Peter Dowding: You will get it.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: They have dilly-dallied around with all sorts of trivial matters.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Like electoral reform. You think that's trivial, I know.

Hon. Mark Nevill: Cigarettes are very good for you, too.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: The Government brought the Temporary Reduction of Remuneration (Senior Public Officers) Bill to the Parliament, yet it has not brought an Industrial Arbitration Amendment Bill to the Parliament. The Government complains that a dispute costing \$1 million a day at Hamersley Iron was caused by our legislation, yet it has not taken the time to ask this Parliament to agree to amendments to the Industrial Arbitration Act, if that is supposed to be the reason for the disputes.

Hon. Peter Dowding: It is a major Bill, and you know it. The indescribable rubbish that you passed through this House—

Several members interjected.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: It did not take the Government long to move to change the Constitution.

Hon. Peter Dowding: That is not as detailed a Bill as the other.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Of course it is detailed. It is a very important piece of legislation and the Government should have thought more about it.

Hon. J. M. Brown: Will you support this when it comes before us?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Of course I will not.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. John Williams): Order!

Hon. A. A. Lewis: He won't consult with anybody.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Members opposite believe that they have all knowledge in respect of industrial relations, and said that we could expect that upon their coming into office the problems would be resolved. A whole spate of industrial disputes are still going on. Fortunately, one major industrial dispute is about to finish, but the other one continues.

Hon. Mark Nevill: I suppose that breaks your heart.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Even though Mr Grill when shadow Minister for Mines suggested things would be different, particularly in the Pilbara, we know that in reality what he said in 1982 just has not come true.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: It is early days yet.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I know it is early days, but in the early days the Government has been in office, just look at its record.

Hon. J. M. Brown: I'm glad we are not getting worse over a short period of time.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: We have had time to change the Industrial Arbitration Act, if that is the problem; but at the same time we have these disputes.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Interestingly, the subject of the dispute in the Hamersley operation is the 35-hour week. The Government opposes the 35-hour week concept. Mr Peter Jones asked a question in the Legislative Assembly on Wednesday, 17 August 1983, part of which was, "Does the Government support the policy of a 35-hour working week in the Pilbara iron ore industry?" The answer was, "No". This dispute is

against the Government's policy. I would have thought that at some time or other the Government could have said in loud and clear terms that it is opposed to the strike at Hamersley because it is against its policy. At least it should give some relief to the rest of the community which is worried about the long-term consequences of such strikes. The community is worried about the effects such strikes will have on this State's economy. Of course the people are worried. They cannot see any rhyme or reason for the strikes continuing. They would appreciate the Government's saying that this dispute does not have its support. As Mr Burke said, the Government does not support the 35-hour week in the Pilbara.

I conclude by saying a few words about the Pilbara in general. Having spent five years of my life living there, I find it very difficult to comprehend why the Pilbara has been subjected to so many strikes and industrial disputes throughout its relatively brief history, because the conditions which have been provided for employees are second to none.

Hon. Peter Dowding: So it is the employees' fault that there has been this industrial disruption?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I am not saying that.

Hon. Peter Dowding: No, you never criticise the companies, do you!

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. John Williams): Order!

Hon. N. F. MOORE: In a graphic way I am trying to describe the living conditions which exist in the Pilbara and to suggest that I cannot understand why the area has had so many industrial disputes. I said a while ago that I thought the companies were responsible for some disputes. I am not being critical of employees now; I am simply saying that when a married employee goes to, say, Tom Price, he is provided with a brick-veneer house with fully ducted air-conditioning; fully furnished; with a maintenance service, which means that if anything breaks down it is fixed in five minutes; he pays very low rent; and he has the opportunity to purchase his house on very favourable terms.

Hon. Neil Oliver: Four per cent.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: His salary is very good. Overtime is not available to the extent it was in the past, but that does not seem to affect the men in that industry. The conditions generally in these towns are very good. In fact, I thoroughly enjoyed my time there. I appreciated the facilities that were available, such as grassed ovals, and squash courts, golf courses, and other facilities that almost every other country town people have to

provide for themselves. These facilities were provided by the company at its expense.

Hon. Mark Nevill: Where did you live for five years in the Pilbara?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: At Tom Price. The facilities provided for employees and their families were very good. I can understand how in Tom Price people could get a bit upset about the road in and out of the town. In fact, I personally was a bit upset about it on a few occasions, but generally driving conditions in Tom Price and similar towns are first class, much better than the conditions in, say, Laverton or Leinster.

Hon. Peter Dowding: What does all that prove?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: It proves that in those other towns we do not see industrial trouble.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Which suggests what? What does it suggest to you?

Hon. G. E. Masters: You wouldn't know.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: These other towns do not have so many disputes. It is a funny situation. I just do not know the answer. Having spent a fair amount of time living in Tom Price, I still cannot work it out. A lot of other people who go there also cannot work it out. I am suggesting that these disputes do not have the support of the people living in the towns. After the dispute has been going for a while they are locked in and they must support their union, whereas initially they did not have to support it. I suggest the current dispute did not have the support of everybody in Tom Price, Paraburdoo, or Dampier.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I never knew of a dispute which had a 100 per cent following, anyway.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Mr Dans said, and the Hon. Phil Lockyer and I agree with him, that we need some resolution of the difficulties in the Pilbara. I know the Hon. Peter Dowding will not speak in this debate because it is not his subject, but I hope that he will at some time or other enlighten the House as to why people in the Pilbara for some reason go on strike and have more disputes than people living in Laverton, Leinster, or Meekatharra.

Hon. Neil Oliver: Or Fremantle!

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Yes, Fremantle. I really do not know the answer. I raise this matter tonight because it is an area which causes me great concern.

Hon. Mark Nevill: They have a tradition of mining in the goldfields and Collie areas which is something the Pilbara does not have. That is a major issue.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Maybe the member is right. Maybe we should turn the Hamersley Iron men into miners.

Hon. D. K. Dans: There is no tradition in the Pilbara, and that is the biggest problem.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I am not too sure about that, but I will not continue that argument. I raised it to suggest that the policy on industrial relations which the Government espoused before the election and about which Mr Dans has talked constantly over the last six years, bears no relationship to what has actually happened since his party became the Government.

HON. W. G. ATKINSON (Central) [5.25 p.m.]: I rise to support the Hon. Gordon Masters' motion. I refer to my maiden speech in which I mentioned the current dispute with CBH and the Waterside Workers Federation. During the course of the debate on the Address-in-Reply the Hon. Mark Nevill referred to the ALP as the light on the hill for agriculture.

Hon. J. M. Brown: Very good.

Hon. W. G. ATKINSON: At the time I suggested that possibly some of the things that had been done for agriculture were quite good. In fact, the Australian Wheat Board has had a tremendous effect on wheat growers in Western Australia and Australia generally.

Hon. Mark Nevill: I hope you support the Lamb Marketing Board.

Hon. W. G. ATKINSON: The Lamb Marketing Board is another thing. We also have the Australian Wool Corporation, which has done an excellent job for the woolgrowers of Australia. However, other boards come under question.

I also referred in my maiden speech to my hope that the Government might use its affiliation with the trade union movement to ensure that exports from this country are not held up by industrial disputes such as the current one between CBH and the WWF. I remind the House that this dispute began as a demarcation dispute between two unions. The WWF was trying to control AWU members on the grain handling facility. That is where it started.

Hon. Peter Dowding: What has escalated it recently?

Hon. W. G. ATKINSON: I do not know. The member's party is in Government.

Hon. Peter Dowding: You know what escalated it, the action of CBH!

Hon. Mark Nevill: Precisely right.

Hon. W. G. ATKINSON: I will get to that in a little while.

Hon. P. G. Pental: You should stick to mines.

Hon. G. E. Masters: He doesn't speak much about this. He keeps his head down.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. John Williams): Order!

Hon. W. G. ATKINSON: The Hon. Des Dans was able to go into the history of the Pilbara dispute, so surely I am allowed to go into the history of the CBH dispute.

Hon. Peter Dowding: I think you should be realistic about who brought on this big blue just before the by-election.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Don't talk rot.

Hon. Neil Oliver: Who is the Minister responsible for this?

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. John Williams): Order! I have called for order twice.

Hon. W. G. ATKINSON: I remind the Government that this dispute occurred just prior to the last election. In fact, I think the union had to call its boys off in case they jeopardised its chance of winning the election. I want to refer to the increase in costs to farmers as a result of this industrial action.

Hon. J. M. Brown: They are hindered by the member for O'Connor in the Federal Parliament.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I remind the Hon. Jim Brown that I have called the House to order on more than one occasion in regard to interjections. I do not propose to do so again. I will take further action.

Hon. W. G. ATKINSON: I wish to leave Federal politics aside and refer to the State scene. At the time of the election this dispute cost Western Australian grain growers over \$500 000. I know the Government tends to be rather flippant with money. This was illustrated in a debate in this place last night when the Hon. Des Dans mentioned that, "It is only a couple of hundred dollars extra for the insurance premium".

Hon. D. K. Dans: I didn't say that.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! That remark was made by the Attorney General.

Hon. W. G. ATKINSON: Please accept my apologies, Mr Deputy President and the Hon. Des Dans. That remark was made by the Government side. In the same flippant manner Government members are going to sit by and do nothing in relation to this dispute while the cost to farmers escalates. Farmers are the share holders of Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd.

We have no-one to pass on our costs to. In export industries we are dependent on world requirements. Surely the Government members can

see this. I trust honourable members opposite who represent agricultural areas, particularly wheat-growing areas, such as the Hon. Jim Brown and the Hon. Mark Nevill, will take these remarks to their constituents and try to do something about it. Honourable members can smile all they like. They should show some concern about the farmers of our State.

Members opposite can point fingers and laugh; they have been smiling and laughing throughout the debate, such is their concern.

I refer to a comment made by the former Deputy Premier (Mr Rushton) prior to the last election who referred to the losses being incurred by Westrail. He said—

At a time when Westrail and the grain industry, at my request, are reviewing their freight contract arrangements toward passing on the cost benefits of improved efficiency and advances in technology to farmers, the present Waterside Workers' Federation strike at CBH's Kwinana grain terminal is clearly working against the producer and the taxpayer.

It has greatly interfered with Westrail's grain transport operations and has already caused a serious potential revenue loss of some \$1.5 million due to the resulting reduced grain haulage by rail.

This is on top of the many thousands of dollars the waterside workers' union's action is causing to CBH and Western Australia's farmers, and the shipping operators concerned.

While the dispute continues, Westrail's potential deficit is increasing by about \$700 000 a week.

I suppose that is peanuts to the Government, but that is what it is costing an industry on one side of the ledger—the transport industry.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: What a hypocrite he was; he wrecked Westrail.

Hon. G. E. Masters: He did not.

Hon. W. G. ATKINSON: We are not debating whether Westrail was wrecked by the previous Minister. I am trying to demonstrate to the Government—

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: Why not tell all the facts?

Hon. W. G. ATKINSON: What facts would the member like me to quote? Does he want to dispute that figure?

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: (Hon. John Williams): Order! The honourable member will

address his remarks to the Chair and ignore the interjections.

Hon. W. G. ATKINSON: I turn to another part of the history of this matter, and refer to the original claim by the Waterside Workers Federation. Unfortunately, it seems to differ a little from the statements now being made in the papers. I referred to this claim in my maiden speech and it appears I have to draw it to the attention of members opposite once more.

The first point in the claim relates to wages and hours and seeks \$300 for 30 hours work. The second claim is for shift work from 8.00 a.m. to 2.00 p.m., Monday to Friday. I asked in my speech what would happen to the railways in the meantime. Would the railways be tied into bringing in the wheat in such a narrow time slot? Farmers, through their co-operative company, have millions of dollars tied up in the terminal. Surely it would make sense to use the terminal for more hours of the day without being tied to heavy penalty rates.

The third claim by the WWF relates to overtime. It states that overtime will not be worked without approval of the WWF. This is the means of restricting the shipping; the workers tie it up by knocking off at the normal time. I referred also to some penalties that applied, including up to treble time for public holidays.

It would take too long to read out all the claims. However, clause 7 refers to meal money and says that a meal should be provided or \$10 paid. Clause 9 relates to an unconditional travelling allowance, and the WWF was seeking \$20 per week paid to all workers. Under the heading of clothing—and any farmer who was able to get this would be delighted—the claim seeks three overalls, two pairs of boots, four pairs of gloves—I thought they put their hands in their pockets most of the time—two sets of winter clothing and then continues, “can change overalls for other clothing (suit?). Employer to launder special industrial clothing”.

The WWF claim in clause 12 seeks six weeks' annual leave plus a 50 per cent loading. Clause 13 deals with long service leave. I do not deny workers should have long service leave, but the WWF is seeking 13 weeks after 10 years, 13 weeks after 20 years, and 13 weeks after 27 years, plus 50 per cent.

I do not deny the right of workers to compassionate leave, but the claim seeks six days for a death in the family. Clause 19 deals with stop work meetings and says the employee is to be paid for 12 lots of four hours—in other words 48 hours of down time in the year to hold stop work meetings. Clause 20 says CBH must make up the short

fall between "compo" and pay. The claim in clause 21 seeks two weeks full pay for paternity leave.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: They did not actually get this did they?

Hon. W. G. ATKINSON: No. I said at the start that this was the original claim submitted to CBH. I have trouble reconciling it with what is recorded now in the paper.

Hon. D. K. Dans: It is because of the stupidity of the Commonwealth Act which requires that an ambit claim has to be put in.

Hon. W. G. ATKINSON: Clause 27 of the claim refers to redundancy and states—

Only voluntary redundancy. Employer must pay all workers redundancy payments; must pay redundancy payments as per Wharfside Award.

I am not fully *au fait* with the provisions of the award but I imagine they would be better than any others in existence. This Government has supported the provision of redundancy payments before the Industrial Commission. That will lead to a horrific situation because some of the provisions of that proposal will prevent employers from employing people.

Hon. D. K. Dans: How do you know what the provisions are?

Hon. W. G. ATKINSON: I take notice of matters concerning farmhands. If an employer decides to lay off a farmhand aged 45 or more who happens to have been employed for one year the employer would be compelled to pay one more year's wages.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I will buy you a methuselah of champagne if that claim is granted.

Hon. G. E. Masters: You support it in principle.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Of course; it will bring order out of chaos.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. John Williams): Order!

Hon. W. G. ATKINSON: I will refer now to the present situation by quoting some messages that have appeared in the Press in the last few days. The first is an advertisement inserted by the Fremantle branch of the Waterside Workers Federation of Australia in *The West Australian* on 26 September. The advertisement states in part—

38 Hour Week—although the 38 hour week is widely worked on the Kwinana strip—C.B.H. refuses to apply the 38 hour week... (Other WWF members have 35 hour week now).

If these people succeed in the 38-hour claim, how long would they continue working 38 hours when the rest are working 35 hours? Naturally, they would not accept any reduction in pay. The advertisement refers to winter coats and states—

Waterside workers and many workers on Kwinana strip working in severe outdoor winter conditions are issued with a winter coat—C.B.H. refused grainhandlers a winter coat which would cost the company about \$2 000 every two years.

I suppose it is one of those amounts which is next to nothing so CBH may as well pay it!

I quote now from a message to CBH shareholders in *The West Australian* on 28 September. The Hon. Gordon Masters has quoted some of these remarks already but I wish to draw the question of cost to the attention of the House.

The message to shareholders is signed by the Hon. Mick Gayfer as Chairman of Directors of CBH and states—

CBH is sick of paying out farmers' money whilst the WWF tries to bludgeon it into submission. The WWF is renowned for this tactic. The WWF's remuneration claims are very extensive and include: Paid stop-work meetings;

I have already referred to that matter. To continue—

5 weeks annual leave;

It has shrunk by a week but it is still up on the normal figure. To continue—

Leave loading of 27½ per cent;

That has shrunk from the 50 per cent but it is still 10 per cent above the norm.

Hon. Peter Dowding: That is the log of claims?

Hon. W. G. ATKINSON: Yes.

Hon. Peter Dowding: When you negotiate you give them your lowest bid first, do you?

Hon. W. G. ATKINSON: I realise even as a farmer that a situation has occurred where one can negotiate. Obviously the claim was made for a 50 per cent annual leave loading so the union could negotiate downwards but still finish up above the present usual 17.5 per cent. That is what I am referring to.

Hon. Garry Kelly: What do you think "paid stop work meeting" means?

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. John Williams): The Hon. W. G. Atkinson will ignore that interjection and continue with his remarks.

Hon. W. G. ATKINSON: Members opposite know very well what a "paid stop work meeting" means. I do not think I need to answer that at all.

I referred to increased meal money in the WWF claim. The union sought \$10, or if a member chose to go without a meal, another \$10 had to be paid. The advertisement refers to increased overtime rates, a 19-day month and a 36-hour week. I have referred also to extensive redundancy provisions. The advertisement refers to the claim that workers should receive waterside workers' rates of pay as soon as possible. I have referred to the 38-hour week claim in the union's advertisement, if they are looking for waterside workers' rates of pay as soon as possible, as surely as night follows day, a 35-hour claim will be next. The next point mentioned in the advertisement is: "Spare men to relieve operators going to toilet". The ad continues—

Supreme Court Writs against Kwinana WWF Plant Operators. Its patience exhausted, CBH is seeking to recover . . .

Hon. Peter Dowding: Do you support the issue of writs?

Hon. W. G. ATKINSON: Yes, my very word.

Hon. Peter Dowding: You would bring the State to its knees at the drop of a hat like Masters tries to do.

Hon. W. G. ATKINSON: The Hon. Peter Dowding has known me for a number of years and he should know my opinion on this; there is no need for him to ask.

Hon. Garry Kelly: Do you agree with writs for individual unionists?

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. John Williams): Order!

Hon. W. G. ATKINSON: I do not shy away from questions, nor am I shying away from this issue. CBH on behalf of farmers is seeking to recover costs incurred by farmers; it is trying to recover farmers' money, not CBH's money. It is my money as a wheat grower.

Hon. Garry Kelly: Are you saying CBH is totally blameless in this dispute?

Hon. W. G. ATKINSON: No, I am not saying that. At the start of my speech I referred to the fact this dispute started as a demarcation dispute between two unions. The farmers are the meat in the sandwich, and we are being squeezed.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Who is creating the problem now?

Hon. W. G. ATKINSON: I would like to complete this quote from the message to CBH shareholders. It states—

Its patience exhausted, CBH is seeking to recover farmers' money previously wasted through industrial banditry.

I could not have chosen the words better myself.

I want to turn now to *The Australian* of 22 September where an article appeared under the heading "Getting the wheat out". It states—

ALREADY before Australia's biggest grain harvest has got under way, the spectre of strike action by waterside workers threatens in Western Australia.

This industrial action must be settled as soon as possible with both sides taking all possible steps to ensure rural exports are not jeopardised this summer.

Further on it continues—

Australia has one of the worst industrial records on its waterfront of any maritime country, with shipping companies adding on a freight margin to come to Australia, resulting in our export industries paying higher freight costs than is necessary.

It goes on—

Grain exports will be worth about \$5 000 million this year, an income we simply cannot afford to lose. Waterside workers, grain handling authorities and other employers must realise foolhardy industrial stoppages will penalise not just the handling authorities and shipping companies, but the individual farmers and their families as well as the nation.

Surely that quote sets out the value of the wheat industry to this country.

The wheat industry has gone through a hard time. Farmers in the Eastern States have just been through a very disastrous drought. We have had a series of droughts in Western Australia which have affected the incomes of families in the wheatbelt in this State. Here we have a demarcation dispute—

Hon. Garry Kelly: It is not a demarcation dispute!

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. John Williams): Order!

Hon. W. G. ATKINSON: Here we have a dispute, which started out as a demarcation dispute and which is costing the farmer and his family thousands and thousands of dollars. I, as a representative of a farming area, will not sit idly by in this Chamber and not say something about the matter.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Get in there and solve it.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Like you did in the Pilbara.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Get in there and solve it. Issue a few more writs!

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. W. G. ATKINSON: I cannot let the motion pass without making some remarks about the disgraceful attack made in the other House on the Chairman of Co-operative Bulk Handling (the Hon. Mick Gayfer).

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! You cannot talk about that. Under Standing Orders you may not refer to remarks made in a debate in the Legislative Assembly.

Hon. W. G. ATKINSON: I shall quote from an article which appeared in *The West Australian* of 22 September 1983, under the heading "Government blames dispute on CBH". In the middle of that article under the heading "Deliberately", the following statement appears—

The Government is of the view that CBH has deliberately fomented this dispute.

A resolution is easily achievable and ended within the hands of CBH.

We are not saying that CBH should agree to each and every, or even any, of the demands of the union.

These stoppages on the wharves at Fremantle and at other ports in Western Australia are damaging Australia's reputation as a reliable supplier in the international market. We have seen that occur already in the Pilbara where the problems in the iron ore industry have been with us for a long time. Some overseas mills are waiting for our wheat. They are running out of wheat and they are getting in touch with us, saying, "Unless those wheat supplies arrive in the very near future we will go elsewhere to get our wheat". Wheat is not a commodity in short supply and it is vital to the interests of this country that those overseas mills receive the wheat so that we earn the export income derived from it. The farmers of Western Australia have every right to seek to recover those losses which have been caused through no action of their own.

HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West) [5.48 p.m.]: I support the motion. I have been encouraged to do so as a result of the attitude displayed by Government members by way of interjection to the effect that the Government is pinning its flag to the mast based on the fact that it has an old Act to deal with.

Quite frequently, I sit here with my eyes closed, but I am always aware of Mr Dowding's presence in this House. I do not have to watch; I can

always tell he is here by the noisy interjections which suddenly start up. I notice that each time Mr Dowding has offered to help Mr Dans in this debate it has been to the effect that the Government is still working under an Act passed by the previous Government.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Amended—emasculated.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Let me assure you, Sir—I do not have to assure Mr Dans of this—the shape of the Act makes little or no difference to this matter. Mr Chiffley once brought in the Army under a different Act and nobody mentioned that. The Act does not matter; it is the attitude that matters.

Everybody in this country knows that the attitude of the unionists in the industries involved in this series of disputes is crippling the country. We are dealing with a State which, geographically, is rather poor, but which, geologically, is rich. We produce a great deal of iron ore and a reasonable amount of grain. In comparison with Russia and many other countries we produce very little wheat, but, by Western Australian standards, we produce a lot. Why is it a lot? It is a lot because well over 95 per cent of the wheat we produce is exported. If it cannot be exported it rots. The wheat industry is an export-g geared industry.

What does it matter if there are fewer or more strikes in a country which consumes all its own products? It does not really matter. However, it matters here, because probably our total export of grain this year of approximately six million tonnes, or whatever it will be, represents less than 10 per cent of the Russian production of wheat. In other words, if there is less than a 10 per cent drop in the production of wheat in Russia, it could take up our entire crop. Mr Dans is very well aware that it is attitude that matters.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Not Press releases.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Mr Dowding is back again.

Hon. Peter Dowding: I am still here.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I did not even notice he was here.

No doubt exists that the general public of Western Australia believe any action which might curtail the banditry, which was quoted in an advertisement, of unions is good. The reaction of many people to Mr Masters' actions in relation to unions is that they were very acceptable. Nobody has seen any reaction to Mr Dans' actions yet, so we do not know whether they are acceptable.

A little while ago reference was made to a one-sided set of arguments. I wish Mr Dans would tell us which of his advisers is indicating to him how

the actions of unions will affect small businessmen. It is about time members of both parties stopped and looked at the union strike problem on a unilateral basis and tried to resolve it.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I said that when I was concluding.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It took Mr Cameron of Federal fame to point out to the unions they were cutting their own throats by their actions with regard to the Industrial Commission, and they are. I am fully aware of the ambit of the demands of the unions. Members of my party have come to me and said, "Look at the union claims which are being put forward". I know the reason for them and one is really quite silly to take any notice of them. However, they indicate the insatiable demands of some people involved in union activity.

Let us look at the true situation Mr Masters was trying to draw to our attention. The CBH dispute is unique in this case, because it is actually a dispute, the payment for which is to be made by individual businessmen; they are the farmers. No one else will pay for it. That is quite different from the situation which pertains in respect of Hamersley Iron Pty. Ltd., Mt. Newman Mining Co. Pty. Ltd., and other big conglomerates and corporations. Who owns them? The Lord only knows.

Really the difference between running a big union organisation which represents many thousands of workers and running a big mining company is managerial skill.

When actions take place which affect a union, one must look at the flow-on which is involved. In the CBH dispute, the flow-on goes to the farmers in the form of extra insurance, extra holding charges, extra costs for keeping the grain clean, and so on.

What about the big companies? If you, Mr President, could start from scratch with a new industry today I have no doubt you would immediately grant it, on agreement, a maximum of a 35-hour week; you would not expect the workers to work more than nine days a fortnight or more than 18 days a month. Why would you take that stance? You would take that stance because you would trade off technological expertise, technical skills, and machines.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Wouldn't you agree technological progress has to be matched by social progress? I will agree with you if that is what you are saying.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I agree with that and it can be done in a new industry.

When Laporte Australia Ltd. was commencing its operations, it was worth £175 000 in equipment to replace one man. Members can imagine what it would be worth in a technical sense to replace one man in a new industry starting today on a three-shift, 365-day a year operation, bearing in mind the weekly wage of \$600 one must pay a man—one automatically dumps that if one is an employer—including long service leave, holiday pay, sick pay, and all the other charges. If a man is on an award rate of \$300 a week, he costs an employer \$600 a week.

If one reorganised the operations of Hamersley Iron and gave the workers a three-day week, the corporation would dispense with the multiplicity of unions and would introduce a great deal more technical equipment, cutting down on employment. However, what would happen if one tried to do that today? If one tried to get the union presidents to agree to that today, one would not get anywhere. To whom does this sort of thing come back? It comes back to the ordinary, little businessman who works out at Osborne Park. He cannot introduce technical expertise. He cannot afford tremendous expenditure on machinery, because he is employing only five or six blokes. He does not have the volume of work to do that.

Therefore, we have these small businessmen employing five or six people on the basis of a 35-hour week, nine-day fortnight and they have to employ casual workers every few weeks to do the job; they have not saved any money as a result of those benefits.

The wording of Mr Masters' letter is absolutely accurate. The Western Australian Government has adopted a policy of buying industrial peace.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: Rubbish!

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I have seen it with Mr Piantadosi's union up on the hill.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: You made a hash of it.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I did not indulge in the underhanded rubbish of taking out buckets of dirty water and giving them to the member's friend, Brian Burke, to bandy around when it was the member's own man who was doing the inspection, making sure the water was clean!

Several members interjected.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: All sorts of reasons have been touted around town about that sort of close friendship Mr Piantadosi had which resulted in his endorsement for the Parliament; but let us not go into that side issue. If members want side issues, I am good at them; I can handle them exceedingly well.

Hon. Peter Dowding: That is why your Government moved you out of this front bench. You performed so well!

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: We are talking about union activity. The second point in Mr Masters' letter is that the Government "has failed to take any positive stand in support of the Industrial Commissions, seriously weakening the effectiveness of those Commissions". I say again what one of the Labor Party's own doyens of industrial expertise, Mr Cameron, said; that at least once a week Mr Dans ought to be reminding the union people that they should abide by the Industrial Commission; they should refer to the Industrial Commission; and they should obey the Industrial Commission.

Hon. D. K. Dans: What do you think I have been doing? Do you think I have been out playing golf?

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: We should make it more public.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Why do you want to read about it in the newspaper?

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Mr Piantadosi, Mr Dans, and Mr McKenzie would be the only members on the other side of the House who have had any real experience with union affairs. To other members membership of unions has been a sort of craft activity.

Hon. Graham Edwards: What a load of nonsense!

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Can anyone tell me what Mr Dowding's experience in union activity has been?

Hon. Peter Dowding: Were you a member of a union?

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I was a member of the Coach and Body Builders Union and attended its meetings.

Hon. D. K. Dans: It has been better since you left.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I do not think it has been.

Sitting suspended from 6.01 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Before the tea suspension I was trying to point out that certain organisations operate in business at different levels from others, and that the small businessman or individual entrepreneur is at danger in regard to most of these big operations. Frequently he can make a profit tax-wise but make an operational loss, which presents some difficulties in application, particularly with regard to unions.

I was interested in what the Hon. Jim Brown and the Hon. Mark Nevill mentioned earlier. These two members, along with the Hon. William Atkinson and one or two other members, understand intimately the relationship of the small business entrepreneur to big business which is in trouble with the unions in regard to the growing of grain. Surely this matter must be of tremendous interest to the Hon. Jim Brown. I remember that he was a member in another place when Gough Whitlam was Prime Minister and Mr Brown got caught up in the superphosphate bounty problem when the farmers were angered by certain policies of the Federal Government. The Hon. Jim Brown was a casualty of that operation. The Hon. Mr Gayfer would remember that.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Yes, I do.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Many members would recall that situation. It is not beyond the bounds of possibility that we face the same situation here. The Hon. Peter Dowding has tried to imply that the strike at CBH was caused by CBH. How he worked that out is beyond my imagination. The people who will ultimately pay are individual graingrowers.

From reading the newspaper and listening to the Hon. Des Dans and one or two other members, my understanding is that currently the Australian Workers Union operates other grain terminals, with the exception of Kwinana. The Waterside Workers Federation has taken over the grain handlers at Kwinana but not the fellows working the other depots. I further understand that CBH has already given its employees \$39 a week. That was before the wage freeze. The Hon. Peter Dowding suggests they should have been given what they asked for.

Hon. Peter Dowding: When did I suggest that?

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The honourable member makes such wild statements during his interjections, that I was not surprised he said that.

Hon. Peter Dowding: I said it was a log of claims. You should listen.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Okay, he says that CBH refused to meet the log of claims. I remind him that his Federal leader and Sir John Moore said that although a wage increase had been granted no claims should be accepted outside that wage increase. The last proposition was in excess of four per cent for one rise and it should be no more than that. Both the Hon. Bob Hawke and Sir John Moore have pointed out at great length to all union leaders that no extras should be requested.

Hon. D. K. Dans: That is the accord of the summit.

Hon. Peter Dowding: That is common ground.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Why is the Hon. Peter Dowding accusing CBH of fermenting this disputation—

Hon. Peter Dowding: By issuing a writ.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: —by not understanding the log of claims.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. Garry Kelly interjected.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: That is the proper answer.

The PRESIDENT: I ask the Hon. Garry Kelly to stop interjecting when I call for order. It is out of order to interject at any time. It is certainly out of order to interject when I am speaking. If it continues I will take further action.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I am grateful to the Hon. Neil Oliver for his suggestion that the reason is that the Hon. Peter Dowding does not know anything about the subject. That is possible. He is an expert on a number of subjects. We cannot be masters of all subjects, so I accept that as a reasonable explanation. One cannot argue that CBH is responsible for causing or fermenting this problem. Therefore the Hon. Des Dans is not correct in putting forward that excuse.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I didn't put that forward. I didn't mention it.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The Hon. Mr Dans' vocal assistant did. He implied the Leader of the House was using that as an excuse.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I said the CBH dispute should be settled in the arbitration commission. Mr Gayfer would agree with what I said.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: All right, we agree on that. The injunction imposed upon them should be accepted. The Government should go public and say that the union should abide by the law. I have a very high regard for the Hon. Jim Brown and I would hate to see history repeat itself in regard to farmers being hit by the suggested extra charges.

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is far too much audible conversation in the Chamber. I ask honourable members to cease talking while the member is addressing the Chair.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I was relying on the newly installed microphones to raise my voice above the hubbub of disinterest in the Chamber. I am a little hurt because I thought my comments were important. I would be sad to see the Hon. Jim Brown again subjected to the anger of the grain growers of this State. The point I want to

make in regard to this motion, so properly moved by Mr Masters, is that ultimately the people who will be most affected are individual small businessmen. In regard to CBH members, they will be grain growers. Mr Brown knows better than anybody else—we all know—how terribly angry they can be when they feel aggrieved when extra charges are heaped upon them.

Hon. J. M. Brown: Redistribution.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Most of us who have made any study of history would be aware of the civil conflicts that have bedevilled the country. If we take religion out, the next major causes of dispute would be taxation, charges, and costs. If this sort of log of claims continues we could see a lot of charges heaped upon small businessmen—the grain growers—in the true sense of the word.

We are worried about the flow-on to the other industries. The Minister should accept that whatever laws we have we will always have disputation. We have had a number of variations in my time, but always we have had disputation, often violent disputation. The Minister should take a bipartisan approach and say that we must have a law in this regard.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I agree with you.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I am talking about exporting companies. It is no good saying a 36-hour week will solve the problem because it will only solve problems in a new industry. We are fearful of the flow-on.

Let us look at the flow-on to small business people at Osborne Park. I know it is habit when talking industrially to mention Kwinana; many people say that is our big industrial area and the area of greatest employment. I do not know if anyone has done any research into that area, but although I am not a gambling man, I would be prepared to bet that there are more employees in a light industrial area such as Osborne Park than in the Kwinana strip.

Hon. P. H. Wells: That would be pretty right.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Employers could cope with a 35 or 36-hour week in the Kwinana strip because the nature of the industry could be altered. If we are to talk about altering the nature of a spray painting shop which does an average of two vehicles a day by hand it is a different story. They have to be rubbed down and a panelbeater has to cut out the rust, fill in the dents, etc. They have to be masked up and sprayed by hand. It is literally a customised operation. How do we bring advanced technology into that area?

We could bring a big operation to an assembly line and make a profit by introducing a 36-hour week. I think all members would be aware of how that could be done, but how could we apply that in Osborne Park? I have taken the trouble to spend a couple of days wandering around Osborne Park looking at the sorts of operations going on there. Some have advanced technology, but not very many because they are mostly small plants employing five to 25 men. They are custom operations. People tend to forget that agreements reached between big organisations flow down to small organisations and bedevil them. I could list a number of operations in which the small business employer is now coping with employees taking every second Monday off.

Mr President, in the formative years of your life you were an electrician running that sort of small business operation. You would be aware of the tremendous problems facing small businessmen when having to cope with extra charges.

We have had a very serious problem in this debate in that most points we have been arguing were brought up by interjection. The Hon. Peter Dowding implied that he supported the Hon. David Parker's impertinent comments yesterday with regard to my good friend, the Hon. Mick Gayfer, and CBH. I even heard the absolutely ludicrous proposition put forward that the ALP was responsible for the establishment of CBH. That is a myth that, I am rather sorry to say, was perpetrated by one or two of my colleagues.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Who put that forward?

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I said it is a myth perpetrated by one or two of my colleagues. That was nothing like the abberations of the Leader of the House's principal adviser on industrial legislation matters who tried to blame the management of CBH for the problems being faced now.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Did you say my adviser did that?

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Yes.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Who is that?

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The Hon. Peter Dowding.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I think you have it wrong.

Hon. P. G. Pandal: The Minister for everything?

Hon. D. K. Dans: I think you have it wrong, Mr MacKinnon. I think the Hon. Peter Dowding can look after himself.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: If I have it wrong so has Mr Dowding. When I was a Minister I believed I had enough to do with my own portfolio;

but I was not that smart, as Mr Dowding pointed out.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: You never want to admit that.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It is obvious because of where I am talking from now.

Hon. D. K. Dans: You are doing a very fine job of it.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Mr Dowding implied that CBH was to blame.

Hon. Garry Kelly: Are you saying it is not to blame?

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Without any doubt I believe the union is 97.5 per cent to blame. The Chairman of Directors of CBH is very well known to me. I know that at times he can be quite abrasive and I have felt constrained to be cross with him, but he is not foolish. No-one with any sense at all could infer that the chairman was stupid or foolish, or that he did not have the absolute interests of the farmers, whom he represents, totally at heart. It would not take Mr Kelly more than an hour to look at the history of the company, which was explained by Norman Moore with a lucidity which his previous customers, primary school children at Tom Price or Leonora, could have understood. Mr Moore is skilled at explaining the situation, with total lucidity, which should be easily understood. What he said was, "It was a demarcation dispute and there was no argument about that". It is on the record.

Hon. Garry Kelly: It is not now.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It still is a demarcation problem because the AWU still controls grain handling at every other grain handling point owned by CBH. That is the situation as I understand it unless someone has enough temerity to contradict me.

The WWF fought a demarcation case and won. Certainly CBH opposed it but finally accepted that situation. Although the grain handlers were AWU handlers yesterday, figuratively speaking, and became WWF members today, which did not change their activity at all, they received \$39 a week more in pay just because they changed the name of their union. CBH paid that extra money with little or no argument. The WWF made many claims which were carefully read by the Hon. Gordon Atkinson. The union has moderated those claims because they were too stupid to be contemplated for more than five minutes. The only thing CBH has said is, "Please go back to work and abide by..." perhaps Mr Dans would interject here with the great word that his leader recently invented.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Don't you realise interjections are out of order?

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: An agreement was reached whereby no demands would be made despite which the WWF on consensus—perhaps it was not quite consensus—

Hon. Margaret McAleer: It was reconciliation.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I have lost the word momentarily; I am sure Mr Dans knows the word I am looking for.

Hon. Tom Stephens: You have never understood the concept on that side of the Chamber.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The WWF, despite the wage freeze, the almost beseeching request of the present Prime Minister of Australia, and the firm instructions of Sir John Moore, is seeking more and more. Mr Kelly is still trying to imply that this problem, on which Mr Dans does not want to take action and reassure the people of Western Australia, and wants to leave it to the courts—

Hon. D. K. Dans: Where else is it going to be decided?

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: —is the fault of CBH. The member is trying to reinforce Mr Dowding.

Hon. Garry Kelly: Any dispute has two sides. Is it totally the fault of the unions? The member has suggested they are 97.5 per cent to blame.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Okay, let us not argue about a percentage point or two.

Hon. Garry Kelly: You are very generous.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I am not jumping up and down. I am trying to convince honourable members that the sort of things that look remote are not remote, such as looking on CBH as a great monolithic structure handling all the grain of this magnificent State. It handles six million tonnes of grain, all for export because 1.4 million people cannot eat that much grain unless a drought occurs in the Eastern States and it can be sold to them. Any costs which are added to this co-operative group come back to the people, and they include members of this House, such as Mr Atkinson, who grows wheat; Jim Brown, whose family grows wheat; and Mark Nevill, who has political interests. The costs come back to individuals. I do not know if a dispute at Mt. Newman does; I do not know if anyone in this Chamber has shares in that organisation. That is more difficult to trace. I am talking of a large, nebulous group of people.

Another problem that arises is the flow-on; the fact that in dealing with one group of people certain agreements can be made following which another group wants the same treatment: A fellow working on a lathe in Mt. Newman, another who repairs trucks at Tom Price, another who changes tyres on vehicles who has a brother who does the same work at a garage in Osborne Park, and so on—all of these workers want the same pay. The fellow at Tom Price receives some compensation for the climate because he is provided with a fully air-conditioned house. How far does it go?

I refer to an article in *The West Australian* on Wednesday 28 September which reads—

RUSH FOR CBH HARVEST JOBS

MORE than 2500 applications are expected for the 1200 vacancies at Co-operative Bulk Handling during the harvest.

Most of the applications will be from students who will be sent to towns throughout the wheatbelt to handle a variety of jobs—clerical, grain-sampling, pest control, moving machinery and manning grain-receiving points.

Ultimately all those charges are paid by the farmer, the fellow who produces the wheat. The Government does not pump in extra money to cover these costs; they are paid by the small businessman. Everyone professes to love the small businessman who employs most of the work force in the country. I am advised by interjection that 83 per cent of the work force is employed by small businessmen; I will accept that figure because I have not checked it myself. These are the people who will ultimately pay for the extra costs. Other businesses are so widespread in their ownership.

I think the best example of the ability to transfer management from one organisation to another—from, say, a union to politics; and exactly the same would apply to most multinational businesses—is demonstrated by the activities of Bob Hawke, the current Prime Minister, over the last few years. He has moved from running a union organisation to running the politics of this country with a smooth efficiency that one must admire. Judging from the front page of the *Daily News* one would think he had also won the America's Cup, but that is not true. I suggest that Bob Hawke could have moved across to some of the large organisations and run them just as efficiently.

It is inherent in the motion moved by the Hon. Gordon Masters that all of us, including the public in this State, want to see Government action in respect of resolution of union action in this

country. It could well be that Australia will follow the trend of most western countries and see a marked diminution in the power of unions, their efforts and authority.

Hon. D. K. Dans: That is not true, the phenomenon that is occurring suggests it is going the other way.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Not according to my sources. I have good friends who work in the unions in America—

Hon. D. K. Dans: That is not true; you are reading the wrong books.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: —and one person has worked in a union for something like 10 to 15 years. He now says he must get into private enterprise because union activity is going downhill. As Mr Dans is well aware, votes are taken in a shop to decide whether it becomes a union shop or a free shop. The percentage of free shops is increasing with dramatic rapidity. Maybe this is the way this country should go. Unless the Minister advocates that the union representatives abide by the court's decision—in other words, tells the WWF to abide by the injunction obtained by CBH and to go back to work—and unless he reassures the people of this State, all the workers, and I include members in that group, will become more and more disillusioned in the ability of the Government to keep control of what is a very vital matter.

It is no good the Government's trying to say that we are hamstrung because we are working under the old Act passed by the Liberal Government.

Hon. D. K. Dans: No-one said anything like that.

Hon. P. G. Pendal: Yes you did, half a dozen times.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It will be interesting to go through the comments that have been made. The only speaker we can check is Mr Dans, and he is far too careful to have said that. However, one or two of his helpers, without doubt, have said that. They have not yet learnt that Mr Dans is a lot smarter than they are on this sort of thing. They should keep their mouths shut. He knows more than they do, and he is a real fox. He knows exactly what he is about. In their helping, those people have hindered him.

The implication has been made loudly and clearly that the Government is handicapped because it is working under our Act. Mr Dans knows that it does not matter what Act he works under; he will face the same sorts of problems, and he will face them because of the human el-

ement. Mr Dans knows that a small, piddling union, to use Mr Dans' word, can upset the works. The best example of that was when the Ford Motor Company produced a four-cylinder racing car—I have forgotten the name of it, and I thought I never would. It was a beautiful little car, and it was to be available from one end of Europe to the other. A problem was caused by a cleaning union of about 200 people at Dagenham; and the company was out of business for two years.

Mr Dans is aware that the engine drivers' union held up a couple of mining towns a few years ago for seven to nine weeks. The moment the strike was over, the man who caused it walked across and climbed onto a locomotive, blew the whistle twice, climbed down the other side, made a very rude gesture a bit like Winston Churchill's "V-for-victory" sign, and left the town.

Hon. Peter Dowding: And joined the Liberal Party, and became the Minister for Labour and Industry. Is that the end of the story?

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Despite all my endeavours to help Mr Dowding, he will come in with that sort of stupid remark, just to let people know he is back in the House.

Hon. Peter Dowding: I have been here all along.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Will he never learn? The Hon. Peter Dowding has on the front bench a Minister who has forgotten more about industrial relations than Mr Dowding is ever likely to learn. Mr Dans has actually worked with the people. I have immense admiration for Mr Dans because he does a good job. He should be left alone to go on with it.

I am suggesting, with Mr Masters, that Mr Dans ought to reassure the people of Western Australia. He ought to consider our total welfare. We cannot afford to lose royalty payments. Unless the royalty payments continue in the export area, we will have to adjust the structure of the wealth that has given us the tremendous ability to do such great things as winning the America's Cup.

HON. PETER DOWDING (North—Minister for Mines) [8.04 p.m.]: I rise in this debate, not because I can add anything to what the Hon. Des Dans has said, but because, as the Hon. Graham MacKinnon agreed, Mr Dans knows a great deal about industrial relations and has demonstrated in the last six months that he knows more about the subject than the previous Minister who was, in part, responsible for the downfall of his party at the last election.

Hon. P. G. Pendal: Don't be ridiculous.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: One would have thought that members of the flat earth society, like the Hon. Norman Moore, would understand that one cannot create a solution to industrial relations problems by issuing Press releases condemning the action taken and directing everyone to play the game. One would have thought that members of the Liberal Party had received that message. The Hon. Gordon Masters was responsible for presiding over the longest strike in the history of the Pilbara—one of the few industrial strikes that went on for a long period of time.

Hon. G. C. Masters: What date was that?

Hon. PETER DOWDING: That strike continued for more than 10 weeks, until the majority of the community in the area supported it entirely. They supported it because of the harsh attitude of the Liberal Party, then in Government.

I rise only because the Hon. Phil Lockyer, who has not bothered to remain for the rest of the debate, said that there had been some neglect, not only by the Minister for Industrial Relations, but also by me and the other members representing the Pilbara area. I believe that the work done by the Hon. Tom Stephens, Pam Buchanan (member for Pilbara), Ernie Bridge (member for Kimberley), and to some extent by me—

Hon. P. G. Pental: Has been catastrophic.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: —has been the sort of supportive, constructive activity which helps in finding a solution to industrial relations problems. Had we followed the sort of blind, foolish behaviour that we see so much from members opposite, we may well have prolonged that strike for a couple of weeks.

Hon. Neil Oliver interjected.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: I really urge the Hon. Neil Oliver to keep out of it.

By being supportive to the people hit by the strike and making constructive suggestions, we played our part. We cannot claim responsibility for the solution of the industrial dispute, but we can say that we did our best, as did the Minister for Industrial Relations, to create a climate in which it could be resolved at the earliest reasonable opportunity.

I do not like industrial disputation. I do not like the loss and the hardship suffered by all sides, including small businessmen, workers, companies, and the families of the workers involved in these disputes. The reality is that by taking sides, as we have heard done here by, successive members opposite they have precipitated further industrial problems.

I know they look on this debate as an interesting one, coming on as it does just before the Mundaring by-election.

Hon. G. E. Masters: You seem worried by the Mundaring by-election.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: The Hon. Gordon Masters made no contribution to the solution of the dispute. It may well be said that the local members and the Minister for Industrial Relations made a small contribution; but the Hon. Gordon Masters made absolutely none.

The former Minister for Labour and Industry would not take the advice of his own department. One would have thought it would have created embarrassment for him when his duplicity was revealed by the Hon. Des Dans.

It is not appropriate to say the same thing time after time, so I ask honourable members opposite—the few of them who have some objectivity about this dispute, and I do not mean the Hon. Gordon Atkinson and the Hon. Phil Lockyer—to give consideration to this matter in the light of the following: At times, disputes are caused because people are involved in a situation where they simply do not agree. The responsibility for that may be on one side or the other, or perhaps the responsibility is a joint one. However, we in the Government and the Opposition ought to use our best endeavours to solve the problems, and not simply create headlines for ourselves.

Opposition members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I remind honourable members of the comment I made a little while ago. When I call "Order" everybody shall cease what he is saying. I take strong objection to members' continuing to interject while I am speaking.

I call the Hon. Gordon Masters.

Point of Order

Hon. D. K. DANS: I would like your ruling, Sir. I refer to Standing Order No. 79.

The PRESIDENT: What is the point of order?

Hon. D. K. DANS: If you read the Standing Order, Sir, you will find that the Hon. Gordon Masters has no right of reply.

President's Ruling

The PRESIDENT: I take the point of order, but I rule that there is no substance to the point of order. Standing Order No. 63 provides for the motion before the House; it requires a certain amount of notice to be given to the President, and it requires that four members rise in their places to indicate their support for such a proposition.

Therefore, I suggest that this is a substantive motion.

Be that as it may, I indicate further that it has been the longstanding practice in this House, in debates of this nature, for the mover of the motion to reply, if for no other reason than for the purpose of ultimately withdrawing the motion.

I rule that the honourable member has the right of reply.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

HON. G. E. MASTERS (West) [8.10 p.m.]: I thank members on this side of the House for their support—

Hon. D. K. Dans: Are you going to thank me?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: —and the very good words of wisdom offered by various Opposition speakers. I am concerned at some of the statements made by the Hon. Des Dans. Above all, of course, we were all relieved to see the assistant Minister for industrial relations, the junior man, stand and support the Minister. I am sure the Minister was grateful for the comments he made. This is the first time the assistant Minister has made a comment about this dispute, in the 10 weeks of its existence.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Do you want me to comment, or don't you? What would you rather?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Of course we received a load of rubbish from that member.

The Hon. Graham MacKinnon made some very good comments; I draw the House's attention to one word he used. He said that in industrial disputes, no matter what legislation was in operation at the time, the attitude was what counted—the attitude of the union, the employer, the Government, and the public. I will deal with this question of attitude. We are talking about the attitude of the present Government and the example it sets as managers and employers. As an example, the Government is stating to the public, "This is our performance". The Minister attempted to white-wash the motion. He has been in the tunnel for far too long, but thank heavens he can at last see the light. I think the Hon. Peter Dowding was probably sitting alongside him; but there is a door, and I am sure that eventually both of them will run out of it, with their tails between their legs. The record speaks for itself.

Hon. Peter Dowding: You are pitiful.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: It is true that Mr Dowding's record is pitiful.

The record speaks for itself. I will not repeat all the statements I made.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Thank goodness.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The question of lost man days as a result of industrial action while this Government has been in power has not been disputed. The Minister rushed outside and got the facts and figures, and we heard not one more word from him. He knows very well that more days have been lost on industrial disputes in the first three months of his term of office than in many months before that time.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Come off it!

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The figures are available, and I will table them.

The fact is that we have heard criticism of the industrial relations area, of the Minister, and of the Government. I quoted those instances. I quoted the occasions when the commissioners have been distressed by what has been said. They made comments about that.

Hon. D. K. Dans: When did the commissioners make comments?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I will read comments relating to the Perth City Council dispute. I imagine that the Minister has heard of Commissioner Coleman.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Commissioner Coleman is a Federal commissioner.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: In relation to that dispute, Commissioner Coleman said that the Press reports on the offer by the Minister for Industrial Relations (Mr Dans) to act as a mediator in the dispute had disturbed him. Commissioner Coleman said this was the role of the commission, but no approach had been made to the commission. Commissioner Coleman questioned whether the Government understood the function of the commission.

I know the Minister embarrassed the commission, and that is why we have moved this motion which condemns the Government for its policy—

Hon. D. K. Dans: What commission are you talking about?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I am talking about the commissions involved—the Federal and the State commissions.

Hon. Peter Dowding: What is your evidence for that? Don't make unsubstantiated assertions.

Hon. D. K. Dans: You are making yourself look stupid.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I read out twice the comments of Sir John Moore.

Hon. Peter Dowding: He is a Federal commissioner. Where is your evidence for the State?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I just read the State one—no, sorry, it was the Commonwealth one. The comment made by the Minister about the possibility of deregistration by the State commission was criticism by him, even though it may have been a personal statement. Mr Dans said—

I am not very happy personally with what seems to be a hasty rush into deregistration.

Hon. D. K. Dans: What is wrong with that?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Mr Dans is the Minister. When the Industrial Commission asked the strikers to go back to work, Mr Dans thought it was a hasty decision. If that is not criticism of the State commission, I do not know what is.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I didn't go up to the hills in the middle of the night and stand over an industrial commissioner.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I gave a ruling earlier that it was in order for the member to close the debate. I am rather hoping he will do that.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: If I could get a word in I would do that.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The point I am making is that the member cannot introduce a new argument.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: When I asked questions of the Minister about certain information that he must have had, bearing in mind the decisions he made for wage increases—

Hon. Peter Dowding: You said that.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Yes, I said that. The Minister said he did not have the information available; but in his speech tonight he said that he took the advice of the Western Australian Industrial Relations Service officers—they are very good men, top rate men—in determining wage and salary increases. At one stage not long back he said that he did not have the information, but tonight during the debate he said that the information was available. Once again the House has been misled.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I said I would give it to you.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The House has been misled by two different statements. How long will it be before the Minister finally decides to tell the truth?

Hon. D. K. Dans: We are the Government and I will tell you when I am ready.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The points have been well made, and the Government should be condemned for its industrial relations policy, which is

an embarrassment to the Government and a disaster to the public. With those comments I seek leave of the House to withdraw the motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

GOVERNMENT AGENCIES: STANDING COMMITTEE

Membership

HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [8.26 p.m.]: I move—

That the Hon. C. J. Bell be appointed a member of the Standing Committee on Government Agencies in place of the Hon. P. G. Pandal.

HON. JOHN WILLIAMS (Metropolitan) [8.27 p.m.]: I thank the Leader of the House for the speed with which he has dealt with this motion. It would be remiss of me if I allowed this opportunity to go by without paying a tribute, and having it recorded in *Hansard*, to the retiring member, the Hon. P. G. Pandal. It is the Hon. Phillip Pandal's choice that he should leave the committee for private reasons. On behalf of his fellow members of the committee I pay tribute to his work effort and the contribution he made. He will be sadly missed. He is a colleague we have come to respect for his deep understanding of the issues involved. He was in fact one of the inaugural members of the committee. When I joined the committee, he was a tremendous help to me. We will miss him, and by the same token we welcome the Hon. Colin Bell. In committee work in this House, no-one has impressed me more than the Hon. Phillip Pandal; he has given more than a 110 per cent effort. We wish him well in the future.

HON. ROBERT HETHERINGTON (South-East Metropolitan) [8.29 p.m.]: As a Government member of the committee, I join with the Hon. John Williams in paying tribute to the Hon. Phillip Pandal's work. It is no disrespect to the Hon. Colin Bell to say that we will miss Mr Pandal on this committee. I am sorry he has found it necessary to leave it.

Question put and passed.

BILLS (2): REPORT

1. Highways (Liability for Straying Animals) Bill.

2. Dog Amendment Bill.
Reports of Committees adopted.

**ACTS AMENDMENT (CONSTITUTION AND
ELECTORAL) BILL**

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. Peter Dowding (Minister for Mines), read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [8.31 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, 11 October.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 8.32 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

MEAT

Lamb: Deliveries

466. Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) How many lambs have been delivered to the WA Lamb Marketing Board in each of the last six weeks?
- (2) What were the delivery figures for similar weeks last year?
- (3) What prices for each grade are being paid to producers currently?
- (4) What is the difference in cents/kilo between prices paid to producers and charged to retailers purchasing these lambs?
- (5) What percentage of lambs being delivered are:—
 - (a) going to the local trade;
 - (b) being chilled for export; and
 - (c) being frozen for export?
- (6) What is the current FOB value for the various grades of—
 - (a) chilled lamb for export; and
 - (b) frozen lamb for export?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) Week commencing
 - August 15—19 251
 - August 22—20 306
 - August 29—23 230
 - September 5—23 622
 - September 12—29 484
 - September 19—33 389
- (2) At export abattoirs:
 - Week commencing
 - August 15—19 389
 - August 22—19 808
 - August 29—16 941
 - September 5—26 683
 - September 12—30 346
 - September 19—37 644

Data on deliveries to non-export abattoirs on a weekly basis is not readily available for 1982. During August 1982 the number of lambs delivered was 34 344 and in September 1982 deliveries were 29 725.

(3) and (4) I refer the member to the Lamb Marketing Board's schedules published weekly in the rural Press.

(5) During the current dispute—

- (a) 16.3 per cent
- (b) 66.7 per cent
- (c) 17.0 per cent

(6) (a) and (b) The information sought is confidential trading information.

ROAD

Shepperton Road: Widening

467. Hon. FRED MCKENZIE, to the Minister for Mines representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Will the Minister advise whether the Main Roads Department will eventually acquire land for the widening of Shepperton Road between the Causeway and Albany Highway, Victoria Park?
- (2) If so, will he provide details of the proposed acquisition?
- (3) When is it likely that the acquisition will take place?
- (4) How many properties will have land acquired from them?
- (5) Has any property already had land acquired as a result of a request from a land owner?
- (6) If so, will the Minister provide details?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) and (2) At the present time Shepperton Road is protected on each side by 3.66m building lines which were gazetted by the City of Perth in 1957. In 1977 responsibility passed to the Commissioner of Main Roads when the road was proclaimed a highway. The department is currently reviewing widening needs, so details cannot be given until the study is complete in 1984.
- (3) There is no fixed timetable but in case of hardship acquisition will be considered in accordance with the existing building line.
- (4) Answered by (1) and (2).
- (5) Yes.
- (6) Lot 1 Axon Street
Lot 1 Dane Street.

TRAFFIC

Electronic Road Pricing System

468. Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Minister for Mines representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Has the Government yet set up a committee to examine the electronic road pricing system—as being established in Hong Kong—as a solution to traffic congestion?
- (2) Does the Government favour the electronic road pricing system whereby vehicles are fitted with electronic number plates which are capable of being monitored by electronic devices buried beneath the roads, and the information—vehicle number, time, date and location—is fed into a central computer?
- (3) In view of the increasing crime rate in Western Australia, does the Government intend to use the electronic road pricing system for possible surveillance purposes?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) to (3) No. The member makes “1984” sound only months away.

EDUCATION

Truancy

469. Hon. P. H. WELLS, to the Attorney-General representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has the Minister's attention been drawn to Peter Cogan's article entitled “School's in—at the fun parlour”, published in the *Sunday Independent* on 17 September 1983?
- (2) Are school age children leaving school immediately after roll call?
- (3) How often do school inspectors make random checks on these fun parlours?
- (4) Has the Minister or his department made any comment regarding other truancy statements in Mr Cogan's article?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) No. The Minister has seen an article by Peter Cogan in the *Weekend News* of Saturday, 17 September.
- (2) Not that the department is aware of, but it may happen in isolated cases. Schools do make either period or half-day roll

checks to keep attendance records accurate.

- (3) Random checks are made with no stipulated frequency. Two surveys several months apart of 100 venues in the metropolitan area netted eight school aged children in the first and 14 in the second.
- (4) No.

EDUCATION: PRIMARY SCHOOLS

Swan Shire: Enrolments

470. Hon. Neil OLIVER, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Education:

What are the numbers of children enrolled at the following schools who are resident in the Shire of Swan—

- (a) Chidlow Primary School;
- (b) Mt. Helena Primary School;
- (c) Sawyers Valley Primary School; and
- (d) Parkerville Primary School?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

The Education Department does not collect statistics of pupils' home locations by local government area. Information of this kind is kept only at school level.

TOURISM

Travel Agents: Registration

471. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) When is the Government's legislation providing for the negative-licensing of travel agents to come before Parliament?
- (2) As these proposals have been discussed by the Australian Federation of Travel Agents, can the Minister tell the House—
 - (a) how many travel agents there are in Western Australia; and
 - (b) how many of these agents are members of AFTA?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) Drafting of the Bill is in progress with Parliamentary Counsel.
- (2) (a) Approximately 500; the precise figure is not known;

- (b) according to the State Secretary of AFTA the latest membership figure is 87.

ABORIGINES

Violence: Investigation

472. Hon. P. H. WELLS, to the Minister for Mines representing the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the call by Perth Magistrate Terence Syddall for an investigation into violence among WA urban Aborigines?
- (2) What reports on urban Aboriginal violence are available at present?
- (3) If the Minister agrees with Mr Syddall, what action is he contemplating regarding urban Aboriginal violence?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) to (3) Mr Syddall's views have only recently been made available and the matter will be investigated.

LIQUOR: DISTILLERY

Swan Valley: Loan

473. Hon. NEIL OLIVER, to the Leader of the House representing the Premier:

- (1) Did the Premier at a meeting convened by the Labor candidate for Mundaring on Friday, 7 January 1983, promise grape growers "that any distillery installed in the Swan Valley should be run as a co-operative"?
- (2) Did the Premier also say that "The grape growers, however, will receive the money for the distillery as a loan and it will have to be repaid"?
- (3) Did the Premier further say that he "would form a body to look at further export possibilities for grapes and would send people overseas to look at additional markets for grapes and other produce"?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) Yes. This initiative will be pursued in conjunction with the South East Asian Marketing Corporation.

EDUCATION

Regional Office: Midland

474. Hon. MARGARET McALEER, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Works:

- (1) Would the Minister advise me what minor works programmes were approved for the 1982-83 year for the Midlands regional education office?
- (2) Have all these projects been completed?
- (3) Would the Minister further advise the reason for any delays, if they have occurred?
- (4) What system is used for advising regional offices of any delays which might occur?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) The extraction of the information requested will take some time and will be provided to the member in due course.
- (2) As for (1).
- (3) Yes. If any delays have occurred, the reasons will be identified together with the reply to (1).
- (4) Direct communication by Public Works Department supervisory staff.

HOSPITALS

Boards: Membership

475. Hon. W. G. ATKINSON, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has the Minister, in setting the maximum number of nine for hospital boards as now designated by the Government, taken into account the special local needs, circumstances and number of local authorities and community groups who desire to be represented on these boards?
- (2) Is the Minister willing to investigate further the special local circumstances of the following hospital boards who have expressed a desire to retain their present numbers—
 - (a) Cunderdin;
 - (b) Kellerberrin;
 - (c) Kondinin;
 - (d) Kununoppin; and
 - (e) Wyalkatchem?

- (3) Could the Minister provide details of extra expenditure incurred by boards as a result of having more than nine members?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) The basis of determining the number of members to comprise a hospital board has not been and should not be related to the number of community groups and local authorities which may desire to be represented on the board. Membership should be determined on the basis of a reasonable number of persons chosen on the basis of management ability and appropriate attributes. With a board of nine members, it is possible to include a reasonable cross-section of the community and expertise.
- (2) (a) to (e) I do not believe that there are special circumstances which are peculiar to these particular hospitals. I am confident that there exists sufficient managerial expertise on these boards to overcome any potential problem.
- (3) The additional expenditure that would be incurred by a hospital board in having more than nine members would be negligible, and is not a factor—see (1).

AGRICULTURE

College: Cunderdin

476. Hon. H. W. GAYFER, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the increased pressure on teacher staff, particularly those teachers who act as housepersons, now that Cunderdin Agricultural College is co-educational?
- (2) Is he also aware of the request from the Cunderdin Shire Council that there is a need to improve extra student supervision at the college?
- (3) Is he further aware of the concern of parents and college council members that the immediate appointment of a houseperson is necessary?
- (4) When is it proposed that such an appointment will be made?
- (5) If it is not immediate, will the Minister give the reasons why not?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) Although Cunderdin is not officially established as a separate agricultural college until 1984, recognition was given to problems of this nature early this year by the provision of an acting principal, solely responsible for the agricultural college. The principal and the teachers who act as housepersons receive additional allowances for their residential duties. The teachers, six male and two female, each receive a \$793 per annum allowance and free accommodation for their duties.
- (2) Yes, a letter from the shire was received at the Education Department on 8 August 1983, and a reply forwarded to the shire on 24 August 1983.
- (3) Yes, a letter from the chairman of the council was received at the Education Department on 9 August 1983, and a reply forwarded to the chairman on 23 August 1983.
- (4) The replies referred to in the answers to questions (2) and (3) indicated support for alternative supervision arrangements but also indicated that implementation of these arrangements is dependent on the availability of funds.
- (5) See answer to (4).

477. *This question was postponed.*

EDUCATION

Teachers: Salary Cuts

478. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Education:
- Is it a fact that school principals receiving an allowance for looking after school bus runs are having this allowance added to their salaries for the purposes of the Public Service salary cuts?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

Yes. This is a requirement of the Act. However, this reduction is being reviewed by the Premier. This review is being hampered by the action of the Legislative Council in removing clause 17(c) from the Bill as passed by the Legislative Assembly.

HEALTH

Tobacco: Surveys

479. Hon. P. H. WELLS, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Health:

In each of the Government surveys conducted to test public opinion on smoking—

- (1) Did any questions require respondents to identify their support for a particular political party?
- (2) Were survey results analysed by age and/or sex?
- (3) If so, what were these results?
- (4) Were the surveys conducted by telephone or personal interview?
- (5) What methods were used to both locate and interview respondents?
- (6) Did the survey concentrate on selected residential areas?
- (7) If so, what were these areas?
- (8) Will the Minister please provide a list of questions asked in each survey?
- (9) Will the Minister provide a copy of each survey report?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) I refer the member to the answer to his own question 445.
- (4) Survey 1 and 2 were conducted by telephone interview. Survey 3 by personal interview.
- (5) In survey 1 and 2, individuals were selected randomly from the metropolitan telephone directory.
Quotas were imposed such that both sexes, and all age groups 18 years or more, were represented in the sample in proportion to their occurrence in the population.
In survey 3, face-to-face interviews were undertaken with males and females between the ages of 18 and 60. Field Workers using a questionnaire interviewed individuals at four different shopping areas. These areas were selected to obtain a representative socio-economic mix in the survey.
- (6) No.
- (7) Not applicable.

(8) and (9) I refer the member to the response to his own question 445.

LAND: NATIONAL PARK

Shannon River: Public Meeting

480. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Forests:

Is the Minister going to accept the invitation to sit on the panel at the public meeting which will be discussing the Shannon basin on Thursday, 13 October 1983?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

Yes. Subject to him being able to modify his programme to enable him to attend.

481. *This question was postponed.*

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Assistance Plan

482. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Mines representing the Minister for Local Government:

When are the amounts of money set aside for shires under the local government assistance plan going to be announced?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

I assume that the question is intended to seek details of 1983-84 allocations from the local authorities assistance fund.

Councils will be advised of these allocations as soon as possible after the State Budget is finalised.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

Aborigines

483. Hon. P. H. WELLS, to the Attorney General:

- (1) Did the Attorney General note Magistrate Terence Syddall's suggestion, reported in the *Sunday Independent* on 17 September 1983, that Aboriginal family leaders should be appointed justices of the peace to jointly adjudicate cases involving Aboriginal law?
- (2) Does the Government agree with Mr Syddall's suggestion?

(3) Is legislation contemplated to implement Mr Syddall's suggestion?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

(1) to (3) Mr Syddall's proposals have only recently come to my attention and have not yet been evaluated.

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

(a) No;

(b) no;

(c) yes, as from 1 July 1983.

485. *This question was postponed.*

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Rates: Forests Department

484. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Attorney General representing the Treasurer:

Is it a fact that rates are going to be paid to shires for—

(a) land controlled by the Forests Department;

(b) land purchased by the Public Works Department due to clearing controls; and

(c) land purchased by the Forests Department for pine planting?

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

Aborigines

486. Hon. P. H. WELLS, to the Attorney General:

How many Aborigines have been appointed justices of the peace, and in which areas do they reside?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

No separate record is maintained of the number of Aborigines appointed to the commission of the peace. However, Aborigines have been appointed at many centres throughout the State.

